THE TRUE HISTORY OF COUNCILS

Enlarged and Defended,

Againſt the Deceits of a pretended Vindicator of the Primitive-Church, but indeed of the Tympanite & Tyranny of ſome Prelates many hundred years after Chriſt.

With a Detection of the falſe Hiſtory of *Edward* Lord Biſhop of *Corke* and *Roſſe* in *Ireland.*

And a Specimen of the way by which this Generation confuteth their Adverſaries in ſeveral Inſtances.

And a Preface abbreviating much of *Ludolphus*'s Hiſtory of *Habaſſia.*

Written to ſhew their dangerous Errour, who think that a general Council, or Colledge of Biſhops, is a ſupream Governour of all the Chriſtian World, with power of Univerſal Legiſlation, Judgment and Execution, and that Chriſts Laws without their Univerſal Laws, are not ſufficient for the Churches Unity and Concord.

By RICHARD BAXTER, *a Lover of Truth, Love, and Peace, and a Hater of Lying, Malignity, and Perſecution.*

To which is added by another Hand, a Defence of a Book, Entituled, *No Evidence for Dioceſan Churches.* Wherein what is further produced out of Scripture, and ancient Authors, for Dioceſan Churches, is diſcuſſed.

London, Printed for *Tho. Parkhurſt*, at the Bible and Three Crowns, at the lower end of *Cheapſide*, near *Mercers* Chappel. 1682.

HARVARD COLLEGE
JAN 10 1914
LIBRARY.
Treat fund

To the Pious and Peaceable Proteſtant-Conforming Miniſters, who are againſt our Subjection to a Foreign Juriſdiction. The notice of the Reaſon of this Book, with a Breviate of *Ludolphus*'s Habaſſian Hiſtory.

Reverend Brethren,

WHen after the effects of our calamitous diviſions, the rejoycing Nation ſuppoſed they had been united, in our King newly reſtored (by a General and Army which had been fighting againſt him, invited & ſtrengthned by the City, & many others) & an Act of Oblivion ſeemed to have prepared for future amity; ſome little thought that men were about going further from each other than they were before: But the Malady was evident to ſuch of us as were called to attempt a Cure, and neither the Cauſes nor the Prognoſticks hard to be known. A certain and cheap Remedy was obvious; but no Pleas, no Petitions, could get men to accept it. The Symptomes then threatned far worſe than yet hath come to paſs, God being more merciful to us than miſtaken men. We were then judged criminal for foreſeeing and foretelling what Fruit the Seed then ſown would bring forth: And ſince then the Sowers ſay the Foretellers are the cauſe of all. We quickly ſaw, that inſtead of hoping for any Concord, and healing of the Bones which then were broken, it

would become our Care and too hard work, to endeavour to prevent a greater breach. Though we thought Two Thouſand ſuch Miniſters as were ſilenced would be miſt, when others thought it a bleſſing to be rid of them, we then feared, and ſome hoped, that no ſmall number more would follow them.

It was not you that caſt ſuch out; nor is it you that wiſh the continuance and increaſe of the Cauſes. We agree with you in all points of the Chriſtian Reformed Religion: and concerning the evil of all the ſins which we fear by Conforming to commit, though we agree not of the meaning of thoſe Oaths, Promiſes, Profeſſions, and Practices, which are the matter feared. We live in unfeigned Love and Communion with thoſe that love Truth, Holineſs and Peace, notwithſtanding ſuch differences as theſe. God hath not laid our Salvation or Communion upon our agreeing about the meaning of every word or Sentence in the Bible, much leſs on our agreeing of the ſenſe of every word in all the Laws and Canons of men.

Two things we earneſtly requeſt of you, for the ſake of the Chriſtian Religion, this trembling Nation, and your own and others Souls. 1. *That you will in your Pariſh Relations ſeriouſly uſe your beſt endeavours to promote true Godlineſs and Brotherly Love, and to heal the ſad Diviſions of the Churches: We believe that it muſt be much by the Parochial Miniſters and Aſſemblies, that Piety and Proteſtant Verity muſt be kept up: And what we may not do, we pray that you may do it who are allowed.* 2. *That you will join with us againſt all* Foreign Juriſdiction, *Eccleſiaſtical or Civil.*

The Party which we dread I have given you ſome account of in my Reply to Mr. Dodwell. *By their Fruits you may know them.* 1. *They are ſuch as labour to make our Breaches wider, by rendring thoſe that they diſſent from*

from odious, which commonly is by falſe accuſations; They call out for Execution *by the Sword againſt thoſe that dare not do as they do, and cry,* Go on, abate nothing; they are factious Schiſmaticks, rebellious: *They might eaſily have learnt this Language, without ſtaying long in the Univerſities, and without all the Brimſtone Books that teach it them. An inviſible Tutor can ſoon teach it them without Book.* He that hateth his Brother is a murtherer, and hath not eternal Life abiding in him. 2. *They are for an univerſal humane Government, with power of Legiſlation and Judgment over the whole Chriſtian World. How to call it they are not yet agreed, whether Ariſtocratical, or Monarchical, or mixt. Some of them ſay that it is in the* Collegium Epiſcoporum, *governing* per Literas formatas, *for fear leſt if they ſay, It is in Councils, they ſhould preſently be confuted by the copious Evidence which we produce againſt them. And yet they may well think that men will ask them [When did all the Biſhops on Earth make Laws for all the Chriſtian World, or paſs Sentences on Offenders without ever meeting together? And how came they to know each others minds? and which way the major Vote went? And what, and where are thoſe Laws which we muſt all be governed by, which neither God nor Councils made? The Canons were all made by Councils.*

If you ſay that I deſcribe men ſo mad, as that I muſt be thought to wrong them, I now only ask you, whether our Caſe be not diſmal when ſuch men as you call mad, have power to bring us and keep us in our Diviſions; or to do much towards it without much contradiction?

But others who know that ſuch palpable darkneſs will not ſerve their cauſe, do openly ſay, that it is General Councils which are the Legiſlative and judging Governours

nours to the whole Church on Earth, as one *Political Body. For they know that we have no other Laws beſides Gods and theirs, pretended to be made for all the World. But when the Caſes opened by me in the Second part of my* Key for Catholicks, *and elſe where, do ſilence them, this Fort alſo is deſerted by them. Even* Albert. Pighius *hath rendred it ridiculous.* 1. *If this be the ſpecifying or unifying Head, or* ſumma Poteſtas *of the Univerſal Church, then it is not monarchical but Ariſtocratical.* 2. *Then the Church is no Church, when for hundreds of Years there are no General Councils, an eſſential part being wanting. And they that own but the* 4 *or* 6 *firſt General Councils, make the Church no Church, or to have been without its eſſentiating Government theſe Thouſand Years. And by what proof, beſides their incredible Word, can they tell the Church, that they are ſubject to the ſix firſt General Councils, and yet not to the ſeventh, eighth, ninth, or any ſince?* 3. *I have oft (againſt* Johnſon, *and elſewhere,) proved that there never was an univerſal Council of all the Churches, but only of part of thoſe in the Roman Empire; Were there no proof but from the recorded Names of the Callers of Councils, and all the Subſcribers, it is unanſwerable.* 4. *Who knows not that the Church is now divided into about Twelve Sects, all condemning one another? And that they are under the Power of various Princes, and many Enemies to Chriſtianity, who will never agree to give them leave to travel to General Councils? And who ſhall call them, or how long time will you give the Biſhops of* Antioch, Alexandria, *the* Jacobites, Abaſſines, Neſtorians, Armenians, Muſcovites, *and all the reſt, to learn ſo much of each others Languages, as to debate intelligibly matters of ſuch moment, as Laws for all the World muſt be. Twenty more ſuch abſurdities, make*

this

this Ariſtocracy over all the World, as mad a conceit as that forementioned: And when we know already what the Chriſtian Parties hold, and that the ſaid Jacobites, Neſtorians, Armenians, Circaſſians, Mengrelians, Greeks, Muſcovites, &c. *are far more than either Proteſtants or Papiſts, do we not know that in Councils if they have free Votes they will judge accordingly againſt both.*

But this ſort of men are well aware, that the Church is always, *but* Councils are rare, *and it's, at leaſt, uncertain whether ever there will be more; and the Articles of the Church of* England *ſay,* They may not be called without the Will of Princes; *and the Church is now under ſo many contrary Princes as are never like to agree hereto. And they know that ſome body muſt call them, and ſome body muſt preſide,* &c. *Therefore they are forced to ſpeak out, and ſay, that* the Pope is St. *Peters* Succeſſor, the prime Patriarch, and *principium Unitatis,* and muſt call Councils, and as Preſident moderate and difference the lawful from the unlawful: *And that in the* Intervals *of Councils he as* Patriarch *is to govern at leaſt the Weſt, and that every* Dioceſane *being* ex Officio, *the* Repreſenter of his Dioceſs, and every Metropolitane of his Province, and every Patriarch of his Patriarchate, what theſe do all the Biſhops on Earth do. *And ſo the Riddle of a* Collegium Paſtorum *is opened, and all cometh but to this, that the* Italians *are* Papiſts, *who would have the Pope* rule Arbitrarily, *as above Councils; but the* French *are no Papiſts, who would have the Pope rule only by the Canons or Church Parliaments, and to be* ſingulis Major, at univerſis Minor. *This is the true Reformation of Church-Government, in which the Engliſh ſhould (by them) agree. And now you know what I am warning you to beware of.*

We are for a twiſt & conjunction of the civil Power

and

and the Eccleſiaſtical, and for Chriſtian Kingdoms, and Churches, ſo far national as to be ruled and protected by Chriſtian Kings, in the greateſt Love and Concord that can be well obtained: And for Councils neceſſary to ſuch ends: But we are not for ſetting up a Foreign Juriſdiction over King and Kingdom, Church and Souls, upon the falſe claim of uncapable Uſurpers. One of your ſelves in a ſmall Book called, The whole Duty of Nations, *and another,* Dr. *Iſaac* Barrow againſt Papal and all Foreign Juriſdiction, (*publiſhed by Dr.* Tillotſon) *have ſpoken our thoughts ſo fully, as that we only intreat you to take thoſe for our ſenſe, and concurr with us therein for our common Peace and Safety.*

We reverence all Councils ſo far as they have done good; we are even for the Advice *and* Concord *of* Foreigners; *but not their Juriſdiction.*

If you know the difference between an Aſſembly of Princes conſulting for Peace and Concord, and a Senate to govern all thoſe Princes as their Subjects, you will know the difference between our Reverence *to* Foreign Councils, *and the* Obedience *to them now challenged as the only way to avoid Schiſm. I hope you will join with us in being called Schiſmaticks both to* Italian *and* French *Papiſts.*

The great Inſtrument of ſuch mens Deſign being to over-extol Councils *called* General, *and to hide their* Miſcarriages, *and ſo by falſe Hiſtory to deceive their credulous party who cannot have while to ſearch after the truth, I took it to be my Duty to tell ſuch men the truth out of the moſt credible Hiſtorians, eſpecially out of the Councils themſelves as written by our greateſt Adverſaries; that they may truly know what ſuch Biſhops and Councils have done. Among others this exaſperated a Writer, (by fame called Mr.* Morrice,) *who would make men believe that I have wronged Councils and Biſhops,*

and

and falsified History: and divers other accusations he brings, to which I have tendered you mine Answer. I have heard men reverence the English *Synods, who yet thought that the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th Excommunicating Canons and the late Engines to cast out 2000 Ministers, proved them such to* England *as I will not denominate. I have heard men reverence the present Ministry and Universities, who yet have said, that they fear more hurt from the worser part of them to* England, *than they should do from an Army of Foreign Enemies whom we might resist.*

I write much, and in great weakness and haste, and have not time for due perusal: And my judgment is rather to do it when I think it necessary, as I can, than not at all. And Mr. M. *would make his Readers believe, when he hath found a word of* Theodorets *hastily mistaken, and* Calami *translated* Quils, *and such matter for a few trifling cavils, that he hath vindicated the Councils and Bishops, and proved me a false Historian.*

And can we have a harder censure of General Councils than his own Reverend Lords and Patrons pass upon them, who tell us that there is but six of all the multitude to be owned. If all the rest are to be rejected, I think the faults of those six may be made known, against their Designs who would bring us under a Foreign Jurisdiction, by the art of over-magnifying General Councils.

I confess these men have great advantage against all that such as I can say; for they have got a sort of Followers who will take their words, and are far from having will or wit impartially themselves to read the Histories and try the case; but will swear that we are all Rogues and Schismaticks, and unfit to be suffered: And they have got young Reverend Priests, who can cry, away with them, execute the Laws; *being conscious how much*

leſs able they are to confute us, than the Gaoler is: But this is but a Dream: The morning is near, when we ſhall all awake. Perhaps you remember the jeaſting ſtory with which Sagittarius *begins the Preface to his Metaphyſicks: Indeed the hyſterical ſuffocating Vapours do ordinarily ſo work, that in a place of Perfumes or ſweetneſs the Women faint and ſwoun away as dead; and Caſtory or Aſſa Fœtida, called* Stercus Diaboli, *or ſuch like ſtink, reviveth them like a Cordial. And worſe vapours affect the men we ſpeak of: Motions of Love they cannot bear; but reviling and falſe accuſing Books and Speeches are Food and Medicine to them.*

One of my chief Controverſies with Mr. M. *is about the Acts and Effects of the Councils of* Epheſus *and* Calcedon, *about the Neſtorian and Eutychian and Monothelite Controverſies. That the iſſue was moſt doleful Diviſions of the Chriſtian World, unhealed to this day, is paſt the denial of ſober men. Whether this was long of the Biſhops and Councils is the queſtion. I have fully proved that* Neſtorius, Cyril, *and* Dioſcorus *were all of the ſame Faith and differed but in wording the ſame ſenſe: And if ſo, judge how much the World is beholden to theſe Councils of Biſhops: But this Mr.* M. *taketh for a falſe Report.*

Becauſe it is our moſt important difference, I will here give the Reader an account of the Effect of theſe Councils even to our times, in the great Empire of Habaſſia, *out of the much praiſed Hiſtory of* Job Ludolphus.

Lib. 3. c. 8. *In order to declare the Religion of the* Habaſſines *he firſt declareth the Succeſs of the Council of* Calcedon, *thus*,--- [Damnatus Dioſcorus Patriarcha Alexandrinus tanquam Eutychis Defenſor & Hæreſiarcha, verberibus quoque mulctatus & in exilium ejectus fuit, alio Patriarcha Catholico in locum ejus ſuffecto---

Atrox

Atrox exinde in Eccleſia Alexandrina Schiſma, cæde & ſanguine continuatum, in cauſa fuit, ut non ſolum multo maxima pars Eccleſiæ Alexand. à reliqua Eccleſia Catholica avelleretur, ſed & Ægyptus ipſa, attritis incolarum viribus, in Saracenorum poteſtatem veniret; qui diſcordiâ Chriſtianorum, utroſque oppreſſerunt; ut exiguum, proh dolor! veſtigium Chriſtianæ Religionis nunc in Ægypto ſuperſit. Hæc atque alia talia Scriptores noſtri.

And the loſs of Egypt *and the South, ſo ſtrengthened the Enemies of Chriſtianity, that this breach let in Deſtruction to the whole Chriſtian Empire: But the loſs of the whole Empire and Introduction of Mahometaniſm, in the Eyes of our fiery Canoneers, is no diſhonour to theſe Councils: It is but ſaying,* It was all long of *Dioſcorus*, and the Hereticks: *And were not theſe Hereticks alſo Prelates and Prelatical?*

But he procedeth, [" But the *Æthiopians* thus re-
" port it, that *Dioſcorus* and his Succeſſors, and their
" followers did greatly complain of the Injury done
" them; for he neither followed *Eutyches*, nor ever de-
" nied or confounded the Divinity or Humanity really
" exiſting in Chriſt, but only was unwilling to acknowledg
" the word [Nature] to be common to the Divinſty and
" Humanity of Chriſt; and only avoided this, leſt con-
" trary to the mind of the Catholick Church, and the
" Decrees of the General Council at *Epheſus*, two per-
" ſons of Chriſt ſhould be aſſerted: For that would fol-
" low, if we admit Two Natures, and two Wills in
" Chriſt. And the word [φύσις] [*Nature*] ſignifying ſom-
" what born or created, no way fitteth the Divinity:
" Nor can the mind conceive of two Wills, in two Na-
" tures united in one perſon, without Diviſion, Separa-
" tion, or Diſtance: And the Humane Nature exalted
" into the ſtate of Glory, doth not will, do, or ſuffer the

" ſame which it willed, did and ſuffered in the ſtate of " Exinanition; and ſo in the preſent ſtate of Glory, " the humanity doth neither will nor judge any thing " but what the Divinity at once willeth and judgeth. " And this being our known Judgment, the queſtion " ſeemeth idle, and a meer ſtrife of Words, for which " Chriſtians ſhould not have hated one another. At *Cal-* " *cedon* they proceeded from Words to Blows, and " fought more than they diſputed: And *Dioſcorus* was " condemned abſent, neither heard nor well underſtood, " as obſtinate and guilty of Hereſie in Hatred and En- " vy rather than by right.]

This is the Habaſſines *Opinion of the Council and Controverſie, falſe no doubt in our Canoneers Judgment, (for alas they are unlearned men;) but indeed much truer and wiſer than their Adverſaries.*

He proceedeth, 'Primo reperi omni dubio carere, quod 'Habeſſini rejiciunt conſilium Chalcedonenſe--- 2. Ob- 'ſervavi eos in hoc errore eſſe, quaſi Patres Concilii Cal- 'ced. Hypoſtaſin Chriſti dividere, & contra præcedens 'Concilium Epheſinum ex una duas perſonas facere vo- 'luerint--- Hanc ob cauſam damnant Leonem Papam, & 'in cœlum extollunt ſuum Dioſcorum tanquam Ortho- 'doxæ fidei hyperaſpiſten qui juſto zelo diploma Leonis 'ad ſe datum dilaceravit; eumque Martyri aſſimilant, ob 'accepta verbera, excuſſos dentes & evulſam barbam.] (*But it eaſed the Spleen of the Bps. at preſent, and then all the following loſs ſeems tolerable.*)*He addeth,* [4.Con- 'ſtat ex multis locis, quod utrumque abſtractum, Divi- 'nitatem & Humanitatem, conjunctim in Chriſto aperte 'confiteantur. Quid autem hoc aliud eſt, quam agnoſce- 're duas ſimul naturas in Chriſto. 5. Tellezius ex Rela- 'tione Patrum ſocietatis teſtatur [utramque naturam] 'reperiri in eorum libris. 6. *He ſhews that the Habaſſines* 'words

'*words have various ſignification, and by* two natures, 'they mean two Perſons--Which (*ſaith* Ludolphus) when I 'read and conſider, I find all to be confuſed and per- 'plexed: There is no certain ſtate of the queſtion, and 'the words are out of meaſure equivocal. Perhaps *Eu-* '*tyches* himſelf could not tell what ſort of Nature was 'made of two, and what was its name, and what was its 'qualities: But that he was ſuch a fool as to think that 'the Natures in Chriſt were ſo confuſed as Water is with 'Wine, and that in ſo abſurd an Opinion he had moſt 'wiſe men agreeing with him; this almoſt exceedeth all 'belief: Certainly the *Ethiopians* are not guilty of ſo 'groſs a Hereſie. Wherefore I confeſs I cannot under- 'ſtand what thoſe frequent Diſputations were, which 'the Jeſuits had with the Habaſſines, of two Natures in 'Chriſt, in which they ſay they had ſtill the worſe, be- 'ing convicted by their own Books, which I eaſily believe, 'ſeeing they moſt willingly confeſs Chriſts Divinity and 'Humanity. To me it ſeemeth likely only that they 'could not agree in words. Do but explain to them that by 'Natures in Chriſt we mean his Divinity and Humanity, '& then ask them which Nature is it that faileth in Chriſt. 'Moſt certainly they will anſwer that neither the Divi- 'vinity nor Humanity failed, but both continue eternal- 'ly. And ſo it's plain, that they take the word Nature 'in a far other ſenſe than we, and that the true ſtate of 'the queſtion with them is, whether and by what com- 'mon Name the two abſtracts are to be denominated, 'which they undoubtedly confeſs.

Now good Mr. Morrice, (*with your Lords*) *you muſt pardon me*, (*or chooſe*) *for thinking that* it is not neceſſary to Salvation, or to keep the Church from utter confuſion, *to be ſuch Criticks in Grammar or Metaphyſicks, as to reſolve the queſtions about the ſence of* Nature,

ture, *and* Unity, *or* Duality, *which you no better reſolve your ſelves; I ſay, it is not neceſſary by Gods Law, but by the Councils: And if I be a Schiſmatick for holding that Chriſts Univerſal Law is ſo ſufficient for his Church, as that a Legiſlative Power in Councils to make ſuch Laws as ſhall tear all to pieces the Churches for* 1300 *Years, and teach our Holy Fathers to damn Millions of the Innocent, is not either neceſſary or deſireable; a Schiſmatick I will continue.*

Ludolphus *proceeding to open the ambiguity of the words, addeth,* [' A famous Country-man of ours, who 'anno 1634 dwelling in *Egypt*, read the Books of the 'Cophties (*Pet. Heylin* of *Lubeck.*) judged that [the 'Diſſent of the Parties was more in their fear of the Se-'quele, than in the matter itſelf: For the *Greeks* would 'obviate the Hereticks who confound Chriſts Divinity 'and Humanity: And the Cophties thoſe who feign two 'Perſons in Chriſt.] And if indeed this be the caſe, that 'the Fight either of old was, or ſtill is only about the 'ſenſe of words; verily no kind of Tears can be ſo ſharp, as 'to ſuffice to weep for this unhappy Word-War; No Breaſt 'can be ſo hard which would not mourn for the unhappy 'Contentions of them, to whom Chriſt by his own ex-'ample ſolicitouſly commended the ſtricteſt Bond of Cha-'rity: No mind can be ſo cruel, which for the name of '[*Nature*] would looſe the knot of Concord between 'thoſe whoſe Nature the eternal Word aſſumeth into 'his moſt ſacred Hypoſtaſis.]

Fie, Mr. Ludolphus, *can you ſo well deſcribe* Ethiopia, *and no better know your Neighbours? Come into* England *and you may ſoon know the Reverend and Right Reverend, who will not only defend this Councils Acts, and condemn thoſe that be not of their mind, but are ready to do the like themſelves, and triumph over the thouſands*

ſilenced

ſilenced, as they judge, for leſſer things; yea, and make that Councils Canons ſuch a Law to the Univerſal Church, as that all are Schiſmaticks that obey it not.

But Ludolphus *yet conſidering, addeth,* [But ſuch is the Infirmity of our moſt corrupt Nature, that where once Ambition hath begun, and from Ambition Emulation, and from Emulation Envy, and from Envy Hatred, the mind poſſeſſed with (ſuch) affections, no more perceiveth Truth, but as with Ears and Eyes ſhut up, neither heareth nor ſeeth, how or with what mind any thing is ſpoken or written by the other ſide.

O Sir, now I perceive you underſtand more than you ſeemed to do.

But yet the Hiſtory is behind. The Pope hath long had a great deſire to be the Church Governour of Habaſſia, *but could never come to know it, much leſs to bear Rule over it. At laſt the* Portugals *getting poſſeſſion of ſome Maritime parts, whence with much difficulty it was poſſible to come to them, the Pope got them to help the* Habaſſines *in a dangerous War which they had againſt their Neighbour* Mahometanes *and* Heathens, *on condition that the* Habaſſines *would receive a Patriarch and Jeſuites from* Rome: *The* Portugals *Guns, (which that Country had not) and their own neceſſity, made the* Habaſſines *conſent: The* Roman *Patriarch and Jeſuits came over. The cuſtom of* Habaſſia *had long been to receive a Metropolitan called their* Abuna, *from the Patriarch of* Alexandria, *who being a poor unlearned Subject, and almoſt Slave to the* Turk, *made* Abunas *and Prieſts as unlearned as himſelf: when the Jeſuits came furniſhed with Arts and Sciences, the matter came to long Diſputes; for the People, eſpecially the Monks and the Rulers, were loth to change their old accuſtomed Religion, called the* Alexandrian, *for that called the Romane:*

The

The King would needs have it done by hearing both parties ſpeak: But the learned Jeſuites were ſtill too hard for the unlearned Habaſſines: One King ſeemed to like the Romanes, but his Son (Claudius) *ſtiffly reſiſted them: Others afterward again needed help, and received them, and by their Diſputes ſeemed really to be for them, ſeeing how much the Jeſuites excelled their Prieſts; ſpecially K.* Zadengelus, *being taken with the Jeſuits Preaching, when all his own Clergy only read Liturgies & Homilies, & never preacht: He ſet up the Romane Patriarch & power, & K.* Suſneus *after him ſware Obedience to the Pope, and reſolutely eſtabliſhed Popery:* Diſputes *brought him to it: And the Jeſuites knowing that it muſt be ſomthing which ſeemed to be of Weight, which muſt make the Empire ſubmit to a Change of their Religion, accuſe the* Abaſſines *as erring with the* Eutychians, *in rejecting the Council of* Calcedon, *and denying two* Natures *and* Wills *in Chriſt. This was choſen as the main Subject of the great Diſputes: The Emperour was convinced of their Hereſie, and became a reſolute Proſelite to* Rome: *And Popery Eight Years had the upper ruling hand.*

But all this while the Empire was in diſcontent: The Royal Family and the Sub-Governours oft broke out into Rebellion. To be ſhort, many bloody battels were fought. The Emperour uſually had the Victory: But when one field of blood was dried up, a new Rebellion ſtill Sprung up. The Papiſts ſtill told the K. that God gave him the Victory for owning his Church and Cauſe. His Rulers, Prieſts, and Monks told him he killed his Subjects, and in the end would loſe his Empire for nothing but bare words. After many fights in the laſt about Eight Thouſand of his Subjects called his Enemies, were killed: The Kings own adherents being no friends to the Roman Change, deſired the King to view the dead, and made to him preſently

this

this Speech: 'These were not Heathens nor Mahometanes, 'in whose death we might justly rejoice: They were Chri-'stians; they were formerly your Subjects, our Countrymen, 'and near in Body some of them to you, and some to us: 'How much better might so many valiant Breasts have 'been set against the deadly Enemies of your Kingdom. 'It's no victory which is got upon Citizens; with the 'Sword by which you kill them, you stab your self. Those 'whom we persecute with so terrible a War do not hate 'us, but only are against that Worship which we force 'them to: How many have we already killed for the 'changing of Religion (*Sacrorum*?) How many more 'are there yet to be killed? What end will there be of 'Fighting? Give over we beseech you, to drive them to 'your new Religious things (*nova sacra,*) lest they give 'over to obey you, else there will never be a safe peace.]

Yea, the Kings eldest Son and his Brother got the Gallans (*Heathens,*) *that had been Souldiers for the King, to tell him they would fight against his Dissenting Christians no more. The K. growing weary of War, and seeing and hearing all this, changed his mind, and called a Council, in which it was agreed,* [That the Alexandrian Religion should be restored: And to effect this they declared, that indeed the Roman Religion was the very same: Both said that Christ is true God and true Man: And to say, There is one Nature, or there are two, are words of small moment, and not worthy the ruining of the Empire.] And thus the King was brought to give Liberty of Religion to the Dissenters.

The Romane Patriarch understanding all this, goeth with the Bishop and Jesuits to the King, *and made this Speech to him,* ['I thought we had been lately Conque-'rours, but behold we are conquered: The Rebels that 'were conquered have obtained that which they desired:

'Before the Fight was the time of Vowing and Promiſing, 'but now is the time of Performing: The Catholick and '*Portugal* Soldiers got the Victory, God proſpering the 'Catholick Religion: But now what thanks is given him? 'When it is decreed the other day, that the Alexandri- 'an Religion ſhall be freely permitted. And here you 'conſult not with the Bps. and Religious men, but the 'dull Vulgar, and Gallanes and Mahometanes, yea and 'Women paſs Sentence of Religion: Bethink you how 'many Victories you have won againſt the Rebels ſince 'you followed the Romane Religion. Remember that it 'was not as conſtrained by Arms or Fear, but induced by 'free Will, that you embraced it as the truer. Nor did 'we come to you of our own accord, but were ſent by 'the Pope of *Rome*, the higheſt Prelate, and the King of '*Portugal*, and this at your Requeſt. Nor did they ever 'intend any thing (againſt you) but only to join your 'Kingdom to the Church of *Rome*. Take heed therefore 'leſt you provoke them to juſt Indignation: They are 'far off you, but God is near you, and will demand the 'ſatisfaction which is due to them, you will inure an in- 'delible Blot on the Lyon of the tribe of *Judah*, with 'whom your Enſigns ſhine; and will imprint a ſtain on 'your Glory and your Nation: In a word, you will cauſe 'ſo many ſins by your Apoſtaſie, as, that I may not ſee 'them, nor the Vengeance of God, which hangeth over 'you, I deſire you to command that my Head may be 'preſently cut off.] Thus lay the Parriarch, Bp. and Je- ſuits at the Kings feet in tears.

Readers, Leſt you think that I have miſtranſlated, to fit the matter to our times, I intreat the learned to try it by the Original: You ſee that the things that are, have been, and that ſin ſo blindeth and hardeneth ſinners, that one Age and Country will take no warning by many others.

You

You see here that the Name and Interest of God and Religion, and the Church may be pleaded by a blind ambitious Clergy, for the murdering of Thousands for a bare difference of Names and Words, and Gods Judgments threatned against those that will not go on in killing and destroying, and making Kingdoms desolate by Cruelty: And that the hurt Satan doth by Witches and Highway Robbers, is a Flea-biting in comparison of what he doth by ambitious Prelates and valiant Soldiers. The dismalleſt Story of the ſucceſs of Witches is that of the Swedes *Witches, by Mr.* Hornick *tranſlated; But what is the killing of now and then one, to the Murder of ſo many Thouſands, the Ruine of ſo many Kingdoms, the Silencing of ſo many Thouſand faithful Preachers, the Perſecuting of ſo many Thouſand godly Chriſtians, and the engaging the Chriſtian World in Hatred and War, as the Popiſh Prelates have been guilty of?*

But you'l expect the Anſwer of King Suſneus *to the Patriarch.*

Ludolphus *thus proceedeth,* (li. 3. c. 12.) ['The King 'unmoved briefly anſwereth, that he had done as much 'as he was able, but could do no more. And that the bu-'ſineſs was not about the total change of Religion, but 'only about the grant or (Liberty) of certain Rites (or 'Ceremonies.)

(*O Sir, you had been happier if you had known that ſooner!*)

'The Patriarch anſwered, that he himſelf had indul-'ged ſome things, and was about to indulge more, which 'concern not the ſubſtance of Faith, (*you are for Toleration till the Fires are kindled,*) ſo be it another Edict might be proclaimed, that there might be no other change. The King gave him no other Anſwer, but that the next day he would ſend ſome to treat with the Fathers.

They that were for the Alexandrian Religion go to the Emperour, and by *Abba Athanaſius* requeſt, that by a publick Edict he would allow his Subjects to embrace the Religion of their Anceſtors, elſe the Kingdom would be ruined. The King conſented, and ſent ſome to the Patriarch, to acquaint him with it. Theſe upbraid him with the many defections of the People, '*Ælius*, '*Caabrael*, *Tecla-George*, *Sertzax*, with many *Myriades* 'ſlain: And that the *Laſtenſes* yet fought for the old Re-'ligion, and all ran to them. But the King was deſerted, 'all the *Habaſſines* deſiring their old Religion. But that 'they that would might follow the Roman Religion, '*&c.*

The Papiſts ſeeing that they could get no better but a Toleration, ſent to the King this Anſwer by Emanuel d' Almeyda, *That* ['the Patriarch underſtood, that both 'Religions were tolerated in his Kingdom, and now he 'loved *Ethiopia* equally with his own Country *Portu-'gal*, and would preſently grant as much as might ſtand 'with the purity of Doctrine, (*viz.* of the two Natures) 'But there muſt be difference made between thoſe who 'had not yet received the Roman Religion, and with 'them they might agree; but thoſe that had given up 'themſelves to it, and had uſed the ſacred Confeſſion 'and Communion, might not be ſuffered to return to the 'Alexandrian Religion without grievous Sin.] By this temperament the Patriarch would have kept the King and all his Court; for theſe had profeſſed the Roman Religion. But the King weakened with Age and Sickneſs gave them no other Anſwer but, ['But how can that be 'done, for I have not now the Power of the Kingdom?] Home went the Prelates and Jeſuits: And preſently the Trumpets and Drums ſounded, and the Crier proclaimed, ['Oyes, Oyes, (*Hear ye*) We firſt propoſed to you 'the

'the Romane Religion, taking it for good; but an in-
'numerable multitude of men periſhed, with *Ælius*, *Ca-*
'*brall*, *Tecla-George*, *Sertzaxo*, and with the Country
'*Laſtenſes*; Wherefore we now grant you the Religion
'of your Anceſtors: It ſhall be lawful hereafter for the
'Alexandrian Clergy to frequent their Churches, and to
'have their *Arculæ* for the Euchariſt, and to read their
'Liturgy in the old manner: So farewel, and Rejoice.]

It is incredible with what joy this Edict was received by the People, and how the whole Camps applauded and rejoiced, as if they had been delivered from an invading Enemy, ſpecially the Monks and Clergy having felt the Fathers greateſt hatred, did lift up to Heaven their joyful voices: The Vulgar Men and Women danced, the Soldiers prayed all Proſperity to the Emperour: They broke their own Roſaries, and other mens as they met them, and burned ſome, ſaying, 'That it was enough for 'them that they BELIEVE CHRIST TO BE TRUE GOD 'and TRUE MAN, and THERE IS NO NEED OF 'DISPUTING ABOUT TWO NATURES, *and ſo they returned to the old way.*

It's worth the noting here, that the Papiſts way was caſt out as Novelty, and the other kept on the account of Antiquity: For Habaſſia *never had received the Pope till the* Portugals *came to help them. Yet are they not aſhamed here to call theirs the* old Religion, *becauſe when they had baniſhed the old,* (*which was ſimple Chriſtianity*) *we returned to it by Reformation.*

Beſides the Doctrine of Two Natures, *about which they ſaw they agreed in ſenſe, while the Jeſuites Hereticated them, three things much alienated the* Habaſſines: 1. Denying them the Sacrament of the Euchariſt in both kinds. 2. Rebaptiſing their Children. 3. Reordaining their Prieſts.

This

This much being done, the Papiſts were by degrees ſoon overcome. 1. *The Patriarch is accuſed for preaching Sedition.* 2. *Then the Temples are taken from them, and they break their own Images leſt the* Habaſſines *ſhould do it in ſcorn.* 3. *On* Sept. 16. 1632. *the King died, and his Son* Baſilides *was againſt them.* 4. Ras-Seelaxus *their moſt powerful friend is baniſhed, and others after him.* 5. *Upon more Accuſations their Farmes, Goods, and Guns are ſeiſed on.* 6. *They are confined to* Fremona: *Thence they petition again for new Diſputations:* The *King* Baſilides *anſwereth them thus by writing:*

['What I did heretofore was done by my Fathers 'command, whom I muſt needs obey, ſo that by his 'conduct I made War againſt my Kindred and Sub-'jects. But after the laſt Battle in *Wainadega*, both learn-'ed and unlearned, Clergy and Laity, Civil and Military 'men, great and ſmall, fearleſly ſaid to my Father the 'King, How long ſhall we be vexed & tired with unprofita-'ble things? How long ſhall we fight againſt our Brethren 'and near Friends, cutting off our Right Hand with our 'Left? How long ſhall we turn our Swords againſt our 'own Bowels, when yet by the Roman Belief we know 'nothing but what we knew before? For what the Ro-'manes call two Natures in Chriſt, the Divinity and Hu-'manity, we knew it long ago, from the beginning even 'unto this day: For we all believe that the ſame Chriſt 'our Lord is perfect God and perfect Man; perfect God 'in his Divinity, and perfect Man in his Humanity: But 'whereas thoſe Natures are not ſeparated, nor divided, '(for each of them ſubſiſteth, not by itſelf, but conjunct 'with the other) therefore we ſay not that they are two 'things, for one is made of two, yet ſo as that the Na-'tures are not confounded or mixed in his Being. This 'Controverſie therefore is of ſmall moment among us:

'Nor

'Nor did we fight much for this; but ſpecially for this 'cauſe, that the Blood was denied the Laity in the Lu-'chariſt, whenas Chriſt himſelf ſaid in the Goſpel, ex-'cept ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his 'Blood ye ſhall not have eternal Life.--- But they deteſt-'ed nothing more than the Reiteration of Baptiſms, as 'if before the Fathers rebaptized us we had been Hea-'thens or Publicanes: And that they Reordained our 'Prieſts and Deacons.--- You too late offer us now that 'which might have been yielded at the firſt; for there is 'now no returning to that which all look at with the 'greateſt horrour and deteſtation, and therefore all fur-'ther Conferences will be in vain.]

In ſhort the Patriarch and all the reſt were utterly baniſhed out of the Empire. Ludolph. l. 3. c. 13.

I add one but thing (ex cap. 14.) *to end the ſtory. As the new Alexandrian* Abuna *was coming out of* Egypt, *the foreſaid Dr.* Peter Heyling *of* Lubeck *being then in* Egypt, *took that opportunity to ſee* Habaſſia, *and went with him: On the Borders at* Suagena *they met the departing Roman Patriarch; where* Peter Heyling *enters the Liſt with him, & ſo handled him as made it appear, that it was only the poor* Habaſſine *Prieſts unlearnedneſs, which had given the Jeſuits their Succeſs: And the Patriarch at the parting, ſighing ſaid to his Company,* If this Doctor come into *Habaſſia*, he will precipitate them into the extreameſt Hereſie. *But what became of him is yet unknown.*

And ſo much for this Hiſtory of the Roman Conqueſt in Habaſſia, *by the* Calcedon *Council, and the Hereticating the* Habaſſines, *about the one or two Natures, and the Eight years poſſeſſion Popery got by it, and the many bloody Battles fought for it, the Prelates powerful Oratory for it, and the Peoples more powerful againſt it;*

the

the Kings mind changed by ſad experience, and the Papiſts finally Extirpated.

And it is exceeding obſervable, that their very Victories were their Ruine, and the laſt and greateſt which killed 8000, *was it that overcame them, when they thought they had done their work. And thoſe that conquered for them drove them out, when they conſidered what they had done: But had it not been better known at a cheaper rate?*

This Tragedy is but the fruit of the Council which Mr. Morrice *juſtifieth: The fruit of a Church determination above* 1200 *years ago. If you had ſeen the Fields of blood in* Habaſſia, *would it not have inclined you to my Opinion againſt Mr.* M. *Or if he had ſeen it, would it not have changed his mind? I doubt it would not, becauſe the Silencings and Calamities in* England *no more move ſuch men; and becauſe they ſtill call for* Execution *againſt thoſe that obey not all their* Oaths *and Ceremonies, and will abate nothing, what ever it may coſt the Land, by the ſtrengthening of them that are for our Diviſion: And becauſe the* 1200 *years experience hath not yet been enough to make them ſee the faultineſs of ſuch Biſhops & Councils, nay, becauſe they yet take not all Gods Laws in Nature and Scripture for ſufficient to Rule the Catholick Church in Religion, without the Laws of theſe ſame Councils, which have had ſuch effects: But ſome Biſhops and Clergy-Men yet ſtand to it, that* All muſt be taken as Schiſmaticks who obey not theſe ſame Councils Decrees, *as the Laws of the Univerſal Church.*

And if Ludolphus *and the* Abaſſines *can ſay ſo much againſt Hereticating theſe called* Eutychians, *much more may be ſaid for the* Neſtorians, *to prove that the Controverſy was but verbal.*

There is in Biblioth. Pat. To. 6. p. 131. *the* Miſſa quâ utun-

utuntur antiqui Chriſtiani Epiſcopatus Angamallenſis in Montanis Mallabarici Regni apud Indos Orientales, emendata & ab erroribus blaſphemiiſque Neſtorianorum expurgata per Alexium Meneſium Archiepiſcopum Goanum an. 1599. *I had rather have had it with all its Errours, that we might have truly known how much is genuine. But it being one of the moſt Scriptural, rational, and well compoſed Liturgies of all there publiſhed: It would make one think,* 1. *That theſe Neſtorians were not ſo bad a people as their Anathematiſers would have made the world believe them.* 2. *That the* Baniſhment *of the Neſtorians and Eutychians accidentally proved a great means of the Churches enlargement beyond the bounds of the Romane Empire, whither they were baniſhed: And this is plain in current Hiſtory.*

I have given you this account of my Deſign in both the Books, (The Hiſtory of Councils, *with its Vindication, and the following Treatiſe.) I add an Anſwer to a Lord* Biſhop *of* Corke *and* Roſſe, *who hath written many Hiſtorical Untruths by his credulity, believing falſe Reporters. As to his and others Reprehenſion of my ſharp unpeaceable words, my Caſe is hard; My own Conſcience at once forbids me to juſtifie my Stile or Paſſion; and alſo tells me that if* making odious Gods ſervants, ſilencing and perſecuting faithful Miniſters, and Perjury, *ſhould prove as great a guilt and danger of Deſtruction to the Land, as is feared, I cannot juſtifie my long Silence, nor that I uſe no more plainneſs and fervency in calling the guilty to Repent.*

The CONTENTS.

I. A *Specimen of the Way by which this Generation confuteth their Adverſaries in ſeveral Inſtances.*

II. In the General Part:

§ 1. *Hard for young men to know what Teachers or Hiſtory to believe.*

§ 7. *Tempting Reaſons for Papacy.* § 8. *Evident againſt it.* § 9. *The Steps by which Biſhops aſcended to Papacy.*

§ 15. *The different Opinions of Popery in the* Engliſh.

§ 18. *The Caſe of Fact diſcerned, what Judgment I ſettled in about Church-Power.*

§ 20. *For what Mr.* M. *hath wrote with ſo much diſpleaſure againſt me.*

§ 22. *Inſtances of above an Hundred Councils, beſides particular Biſhops, all before* An. 1050. *of whom I appeal to the Conſciences of all ſober Men, whether they have not been the Tearers of the Church.*

General Inſtances of the greater Schiſms ſince then by popiſh Bps.

Some Queſtions put to Mr. M. *and ſome Reaſons to abate his diſpleaſure.*

§ 22. *Of a late Book of the Hiſtory of my Life, to prove me the worſt of men.*

§ 24. *Whether I be guilty of falſifying Hiſtory.*

III. The particular Anſwer to Mr. *M's* Vindication.

Ch. 1. *The Reaſon and Deſign of my Hiſtory of the Schiſms of Biſhops and Councils.*

Ch. 2. *Whether we ought to tell of the Biſhops and Councils Church-corrupting Ways.*

Ch. 3. *Of Mr.* M's *Induſtry to ſhew me to be unlearned.*

Ch. 4. *Whether I vainly name Hiſtorians which I never read.*

Ch. 5. *Of my uſe of Tranſlations, and following* Binnius.

Ch. 6. *His charge of my own miſtranſlations and miſtakes.*

Ch. 7. *His falſe Suppoſition that I am only for a Church of one Congregation.*

Ch. 8. *His falſe Suppoſition that I am againſt* Dioceſanes, *when it's only the ill ſpecies.*

Ch. 9. *And that I am a Independent, and yet plead for Presbyterians.*

Ch. 10. *His falſe Accuſation that I make the Biſhops the cauſe of all Hereſies and Schiſms.* Ch. 11.

The Contents.

Ch. 11. *And that I mention all the Biſhops Faults and none of their Goodneſs.*

Ch. 12. *His Accuſation of Spite, Malice, and Railing examined, Dr.* Burnet *ſatisfied.*

Ch. 13. *His Suppoſition that I ſpeak againſt all Biſhops Councils.*

Ch. 14. *Some mens Credit about ancient Hiſtory, tried by their Hiſtory of this Age. Twenty Inſtances of the Hiſtory of our times. My own experience of it. Whether I hate compliance with Superiours, or to preach by Licence.*

Ch. 15. *Mr. M. Magiſterial authoriſing or rejecting what Hiſtorians he pleaſes. His Accuſation of* Socrates *and* Sozomene, *and valuing* Valeſius, Simond, *&c.*

Ch. 16. *His Obſervation on my Notes of credible and incredible Hiſtory. His Inſtances of my Railing particularly conſidered. Whether the word* [Hereticating] *be railing or cauſeleſs. An Inſtance of Fifty five of Bp. St.* Philaſtrius's *accuſed Hereſies, by which I deſire any ſober man to judge. Other Inſtances. Whether St.* Theophilus, *or* Socrates *and* Sozomene *were the Criminals. Even Pope* Honorius *and* Vigilius *hereticated for being wiſer than other Popes.*

Ch. 17. *Of his Cenſure of my Deſign and Church-Principles: Whether I be guilty of expoſing Chriſtianity more than* Julian *&* Lucian.

Ch. 18. *Of his* 2d *Chap. Who is moſt againſt Diſcipline. Of Anathematiſing. Whether* Novatus *was a Biſhop or an ordaining Presbyter. Councils for rebaptiſing. His Self-contradictions. Some Queſtions to him. Whether the* Dioceſane *Party (as Mr.* Dodwel) *who nulliſie our Sacraments, are Hereticks, if the Re-baptiſers were ſuch. The old qu. was not of Rebaptiſing Hereticks, but of ſuch as Hereticks had baptiſed. Of the* Donatiſts *and many Councils. Of our Liturgy's Rule to find* Eaſter-day. *What the* Novatians *held.* Petavius *and* Albaſpineus *Teſtimony of them. His quarrels about* Epiphanius, *the* Arians, *the* Audians *divers Synods.* Antioch. *Of the* Circumcellians. Optatus *of the* Donatiſts *as Brethren. His Excuſe of the Biſhops.*

Ch. 19. *Of the 1ſt General Council at* C. P. *Whether Biſhops followed Emperours. Their uſage of* Greg. Nazianz. . *Of the* Priſcillianiſts, *the Biſhops, and* Martin. *Of my Letter to Dr.* Hill. *Of the Council at* Capua. Jovinian, Eaſter, African *Bps.* Donatiſts. Theophilus. *Altars.*

Ch. 20.

Ch. 20. *His* 5 *Chap. Of the* 1*ſt* Epheſ. *Council. His reviling* Socrates *and* Sozomene, *as againſt* Cyril. Cyrils *Story. Of the Presbyterians Cruelty.* Neſtorius *Caſe. His cavils againſt my Tranſlations. The effects of that Council at this day conſidered.*

Ch. 21. *Of the* 2*d* Epheſ. *Council. Of* Cyril, *the* Eutychians, *and* Dioſcorus.

Ch. 22. *Of the* Calcedon *Council:* Pulcheria *and* Eudocia. *What one ſound man can do in a Council. Whether our late Conciliatory Endeavours about* Arminianiſm, *have been as vain as theſe Councils. Of* Theodoſ. 2. *and the* Eutychians. *The whole ſtory of that Council.* Luther *as well as I, makes the Controverſie verbal. Of the Biſhops* Peccavimus: *Many Accuſations reſelled: More of the Councils Succeſſes, and late Conciliators. The* Weſtminſter *Synod. Mr.* M's *way of Concord. Of the old Conformity and ours. Mr.* Edwards *Gangrena, and the late Sects and Hereſies.*

Ch. 24. *Of his 7th Chapter. Of the old Hereſies. Whether Projects for Moderation have been the chief diſtracters of the Church. He oft falſly ſaith, that I charge the Biſhops with all the hereſies in the world. What it is that I ſay of them. The true cauſe of Schiſm confeſſed. His miſreports of the cauſe and Biſhops. His falſe ſaying of me that I compared* Oliver *and his ſon to* David *and* Solomon *My profeſt Repentance which he feigneth me an Enemy to. What Nonconformity is, and what his miſreports of it. An explicatory profeſſion of the meaning of this Book againſt Miſinterpreters.*

THE

THE Ready Way OF Confuting Mr. Baxter, A SPECIMEN OF THE PRESENT MODE OF Controverſie in England.

Joh. 8. 44. 1 *King.* 22. 22. *Prov.* 29. 12. & 19. 5, 9. *Rev.* 21. 8. & 22. 15.

IN 1662. Dr. *Boreman* of *Trinity-Colledge* in *Cambridge*, Publiſhed a Book againſt me, as having written to Dr. *Hill* againſt *Phyſical-Predetermination to Sin*; and in it ſaith, That it is reported, *That I kill'd a Man with my own Hand in cold Blood; and if it be not true, I am not the firſt that have been wronged.* The Man, though promoted to the Charge of this Pariſh, St. *Giles in the Fields*,

was accounted so weak, (forbearing his Ministry, and saying he was suspended some Years before he died) that I thought it vain to take publick Notice of his Words; neither imagining whence he had them, nor ever hearing of them before.

But a few Weeks before the late *Plot* was reported, one Mr. *P.* came to me, and told me, That at the Coffee-House in *Fullers-Rents*, where *Papists* and *Protestants* used familiarly to meet; he provoking the *Papists* to Answer my Books, or to Dispute with me, was answered by a Gentleman of this Parish, said to be of the Church of *England*, That [*Mr.* Baxter *had kill'd a Man in cold Blood with his own Hand.*] Mr. *P.* provoked him by a Wager to make it good. He refusing the Wager, was told, He should hear of it publickly, unless he would ask me Forgiveness. After some time, the Gentleman came to me with Mr. *Tasborough*, (since imprisoned, as is known) and with great Civility, ask't me Forgiveness. He was the Son of a Knight, and Judge, of my Acquaintance; and had an Aunt, that had been my very dear Friend. I told him, That Slandering is so common, and asking Forgiveness so rare, that I took it for a note of great Ingenuity in him; and, as I must forgive all Men as a Christian, so I could easily forgive any wrong to one related to such a Friend of mine. He told me, He was resolved openly to confess his Fault, and to vindicate me on all Occasions.

Accordingly, at the same Coffee-House, he openly declared his Repentance. Upon which, Mr. *P.* tells me, That Mr. *G.* an Aged Lawyer, Brother to the Lady *Ab.* was displeased, and said, He would prove the thing true by many Witnesses: (And, saith Mr. *P.* the Story among some of them was, That a Tinker did beat his Kettle at my Door, and being disturbed by him, I pistoll'd him, and was tryed for my Life at *Worcester.*) Mr. *P.* said, He provoked Mr. *G.* to lay a Wager on it: And he refusing, was told, [*Then he should hear of it in Westminster-Hall.*] Upon this, saith Mr. *P.* his Fellow-*Catholicks* ingenuously resolved to disown him, unless he would ask Forgiveness; which he being unwilling to come to me to do, Mr. *P.* saith, He at last performed before *Him*, and Capt. *Edmund Hampden.*

All this being done without my Knowledge (till after,) I was relating it to Mr. *John Humfrey: Why* (saith he) *I did twelve Years ago hear Dr.* Allestry, *now Regius-Professor in* Oxford, *say the like, That he could not think well of that Man, that had kill'd a Man in cold Blood with his own Hand.*

I little

I little regarded all the reſt: But Dr. *Alleſtry* had many Years been my old School-Fellow; many a time I had taught him; and he was the beſt at Learning, and of the honeſteſt Diſpoſition of any Boy that ever I knew; and I thought, if *Parties* could draw ſuch as he into ſuch Guilt, there was little Account to be made of the Reports or Hiſtory of Men, if once they fell into different Factions. Wherefore I wrote to him what Mr. *Humfrey* told me, and received from him this honeſt ingenuous Letter, which I here annex.

And as to all this Story, I do here ſolemnly profeſs, That I never killed, wounded, or hurt any Man in my Life, (ſave one Man, whoſe Leg I hurt with playful Wreſtling, when I was a Boy, and once or twice boxing with School-Boys, and correcting Lads when I was one Year a School-Maſter.) Nor in all the Wars, or in my Life, did I ever ſee any other kill any Man, ſave one; and that was at the ſame Bickering, (about Forty of a Side) when *Jennings* was wounded: While they were Fighting with him in one great Field, I being in another near the Houſe, ſaw the Souldiers offering Quarter to a Foot-Souldier, and promiſing him Safety, if he would lay down his Musket; which he did not, but ſtruck at them; and Captain *Holdich* ſhot him dead: And it proved after to be a *Welſh*-man, that underſtood not *Engliſh*; which grieved them when they knew it.

I have gone the next day where Fights have been, and ſeen many dead, when I had nothing to do with the Armies of either Part. But I never ſaw any, to my Knowledge, kill or hurt any Man, but this one.

Dr. *Alleſtry*'s Letter; (Which I ſhould not Publiſh, but that even in *Oxford*, and elſewhere among the Clergy, the Report yet goeth on.)

SIR,

I *Muſt profeſs ſincerely, That I cannot recollect I ever ſaid ſuch Words of you to Mr.* Humfrey, *as it ſeems he does affirm I did: But yet I cannot but acknowledge, it is very poſſible, that I related, (and may be, to Him) That I had heard, you kill'd a Man in cold Blood: Since I very well remember, that above Thirty Years ſince, at the End of the War, I heard that publickly*

lickly ſpoken before Company; and with this farther Circumſtance, that it was a Souldier, who had been a Priſoner ſome Hours. Now this Report relating to the Wars, in which (I fear) ſuch Things were no great Rarities, and from my very tender Youth, I having not had the leaſt Converſe with you, nor likely of any for the future, did not therefore apprehend, at preſent, any Concern or Occaſion of inquiring, whether it were true; of which, upon that confident Aſſeveration, I did make no doubt. And I took ſo little thought of laying up the Relation, that I proteſt to you, as in the Preſence of Almighty God, *it is impoſſible for me to recover, who made up that Company in which I heard it, or from whom I heard it: And I wonder, how it came into my Mind, to ſay that I had heard it, ſo long after. But however, though it be ſome Eaſe to me, to believe the late Diſcourſes of it, do not come from my relating ſo long ſince that I heard it, neither are likely to receive any Confirmation from it, unleſs it be made more Publick than I have made it; yet I do profeſs, it is a great Affliction to me, to have ſpoken that, though but as a Report, which (it ſeems) was a Slander, (for ſo I believe it, upon your Aſſeveration) and not having endeavoured to know whether it were true. And, as I have beg'd* God's *Forgiveneſs of it; ſo I heartily deſire, You will forgive me. And if I could direct my ſelf to any other way of Satisfaction, I would give it. This is the whole Account I can give of this Matter; to which I ſhall only add, That I am,*

Eaton-Coll. Dec. 13. 1679.

SIR,

Your very Affectionate Servant,

Richard Alleſtry.

II. In the Preface to the Life of Dr. *Heylin* are theſe Words.

Mr. Baxter *may be pleaſed to call to mind, what was done to the Major* Jennings, *the laſt War, in that Fight that was between* Lyndſel *and* Longford, *in the County of* Salop; *where the* Kings *Party, having unfortunately the worſt of the Day, the poor Man was ſtript almoſt naked, and left for*

for dead in the Field: But Mr. Baxter, *and one Lieutenant* Hurdman, *taking their Walk among the wounded and dead Bodies, perceived some Life left in the Major, and* Hurdman *run him through the Body in cold Blood; Mr.* Baxter *all the while looking on, and taking off with his own Hand, the* Kings *Picture from about his Neck; telling him, as he was swiming in his Gore, That he was a Popish Rogue, and that was his Crucifix: Which Picture was kept by Mr.* Baxter *for many Years, till it was got from him (but not without much difficulty) by one Mr.* Somerfield, *who then lived with* Sir Thomas Rous, *and generously restored it to the poor man, now alive at* Wick *near* Pershore *in* Worcestershire, *although at the Fight supposed to be dead: being, after the Wounds given him, drag'd up and down the Field by the merciless Souldiers; Mr.* Baxter *approving of the inhumanity, by feeding his Eyes with so bloody, and so barbarous a Spectacle.*

I Thomas Jennings, *Subscribe to the truth of this Narrative above mentioned; and have hereunto put my Hand and Seal this second Day of* March 1682. Thomas Jennings. *Signed and Sealed,* March 2. 1682. *in the Presence of* John Clark, *Minister of* Wick, Thomas Dacke. *Published by* George Vernon, *Minister.*

The like was before Published by *Roger L'Strange.*

Answ. I do not think Major *Jennings* knowingly made this Lye, but was directed by some bodies Report, and my sending him the *Medal.* I do solemnly protest, 1. That, to my Knowledge, I never saw Major *Jennings*: 2. That I never saw Man wound, hurt, strip, or touch him: 3. That I never spake a word to him, much less any word here affirmed: 4. That I neither took the Picture from about his Neck, nor saw who did it: 5. That I was not in the Field, when it was done: 6. That I walked not among any wounded or dead; nor heard of any kild, but the one Man before-mentioned. 7. That the Picture was never got from me with difficulty. But that this is the Truth: The *Parliament* had a few Men in *Longford* House, and the *King* at *Lyndsel*, about a Mile and a half a-sunder; who used oft to skirmish, and dare each other in the Fields between. My Innocent Father being Prisoner at *Lyndsel*, and I being at *Longford*, resolved not to go thence till he was delivered. I saw the Souldiers go out, as they oft did, and in another Field discerned them to meet and Fight: I know not, that they had seen *Jennings*; but, being in the House, a Souldier shewed a small *Medal* of Guilt Silver, bigger than a Shilling; and told us, That he wounded *Jennings*, and took his Coat, and took that *Medal* from about his Neck. I bought it of him for 18*d.* no one offering him more. And some Years after (the first time that I heard

I heard where he was, freely desired Mr. *Somerfield* to give it him from me, that had never seen him; supposing it was a mark of Honour, which might be useful to him. And now all these Lies, are all the Thanks that ever I had.

III. The *Observator*, N. 96. saith, [Tor. *Who saith, they (the Presbyterians) brought in the* King, *besides your self?* Wh. *Mr.* Hunt, *the Author of the Conformists Plea, Mr.* Baxter *and who not?*

Tor. *Prethee ask Mr.* Baxter, *If he knows who it was, that went with five or six more of his own Cloth and Character, to General* Monk, *upon his coming up to* London, *in* 1659; *and finding a great deal of Company with him, told his Excellency, That he found his time was precious, and so would not trouble him with many Words: But as they were of great weight, so he hoped, they would make an answerable Impression on him: I hear a Report, Sir,* (saith he) *that you have some thoughts of calling back the* King; *but it is my Sense, and the Sense of these Gentlemen here with me, that it is a thing you ought not to do on any termes: For Prophanness is so inseparable from the Royal Party, that if ever you bring the* King *back, the Power of Godliness will most certainly depart from this Land.*

Answ. Dr. *Manton* (and whether any other, I remember not) went once with me to General *Monk*, and it was to congratulate him; but with this request, That he would take care, *that Debauchery and Contempt of Religion might not be let loose, upon any mens pretence of being for the King, as it already began with some to be.* But there was not one word by me spoken, (or by any one, to my remembrance) *against his calling back the King*, nor any of the rest here adjoyned; but as to me, it is a meer Fiction.

And the *King* was so sensible of the same that I said, that he sent over a Proclamation against such Men, as while they called themselves the *Kings Party*, did live in Debauchery and Prophanness; which Proclamation so rejoyced them that were after *Nonconformists*, that they read it publickly in the Churches. Such gross Falshoods as these, are part of the Evil deprecated.

As to his Question, *Whether the Presbyterians brought in the King?* Who can affirm or deny any thing of equivocal Words? A *Presbyterian* is, who these Men will call such. They that in the Face of the World deny the Publick Acts of Three Kingdoms, in the Age they were done in, no wonder if they multiply the grossest Lies of such as I. The Parties that restored the *King*, were these; 1. The Excluded Members of the *Long Parliament*, the Ministers that were since

ſince ſilenced; and the fruſtrated endeavours of the *Scotch Armies*, and Sir *George Booth*, Sir *Thomas Middleton*, joyning with ſome of the *Kings* Souldiers, prepared Mens minds to it. 2. General *Monke*, and his Army, who were Fighting againſt the King a little before, expreſt *Cromwels* Army. 3. The *Long-Parliament* Members reſtored, agreed to diſſolve themſelves, and ſet up a Council to call home the *King*. 4. Sir *Thomas Allen*, Lord Mayor, and the Aldermen, invited General *Monk* into the City, who joyning with him, turned the Scales. 5. The City Miniſters (called *Presbyterians*) perſwaded the Lord Mayor to this, and wrote to *Monks* Colonels (called *Presbyterians*) to be for the King; (ſpecially Mr. *Aſh*, by Mr. *Calamy*'s Counſel.) 6. The Lord *Mazarine*, Lord *Broghil*, and others of the ſame Party in *Ireland*, contributed their help; and Colonel *Bridges*, with others, ſurprized *Dublin* Caſtle. 7. Many of the Old *Parliament* Men openly provoked *Gen' Monk*, and ſecretly perſwaded and treated with him, to bring in the *King* (whom the Earl of *Angleſey*, the Earl of *Shaftſbury*, and others yet living, can Name to you.) 8. The *Parliament* called by General *Monk*, (by agreement with the *Long-Parliament*,) accounted moſtly of the ſame Party, Voted the *Kings* Return: Which no doubt alſo, the Old Royaliſts moſt earneſtly deſired, and endeavoured.

This is the Hiſtorical Truth; which if in this Age, Men will deny, I will bear any lies that they ſhall ſay or ſwear of me.

Now, either the *foreſaid Armies*, *Parliament men*, *Miniſters*, &c. *were Presbyterians*, *or not*. *If they were not*; then, 1. Say no more, that it *was Presbyterians that raiſed War againſt the King*; but that it was the *Epiſcopal* Men, if theſe were ſuch. 2. Why then have you called them *Presbyterians* ſo long, and do ſo ſtill? But if *they were Preſbyterians*, then it *was ſuch that Reſtored the King*. But alas, how contemptible, yea, how odious is Truth grown to this Generation!

IV. There is yet a more Famous Hiſtorian, than any of theſe, though unnamed; who pretending to militate after Dr. *Stillingfleet*, as in a 2d. *Part againſt Separation*, takes on him to give you the Hiſtory of my Life. Partly making it my Reproach, that when I grew to Underſtanding, I remembred how many Drunken or Ignorant Readers had been my Teachers: Partly raking up retracted and obliterated Paſſages of Old Writings; while at once they perſwade me to Reviews and Retractations: Partly heaping up abundance of down right Falſhoods: Partly clipping Sentences, and leaving out

the

the part that ſhould make them underſtood, and turning true Words, by perverſion, into Falſhoods: And partly by mixing this known Truth, [*That I was on the Parliaments ſide, and openly declared it.*]

But when at the new Model, I ſaw that they changed their Cauſe, I changed my Practice, & was from the Day that I went into the Army, a reſolved Oppoſer of all that they did, to the Changing of the *Government*, & their *Uſurpation*; & was ſent among them to that end; which was immediately after *Naſeby* Fight: And continued openly diſowning the Uſurpation, and the Means that ſet it up. And though I was Preaching and Writing againſt the ſaid Uſurpers, when an Army was Fighting for them, againſt the *King*, and the *King* knew how to forgive and Honour them, that did ſo much to his Reſtoration; yet are the Accuſers ſo far from forgiving thoſe that never perſonally hurt a Man, that they forbear not multiplying falſe Accuſations; yea, and accuſing thoſe Miniſters, and private Men that never had to do with Wars: Yea, the ſame Men that then wrote againſt me for the Changers and Uſurpers, have ſince been the fierce Accuſers of us, that oppoſed them.

And if theſe Men be unſatisfyed of my preſent Judgment, I have no hope of giving them Satisfaction, if all will not do it, which I have largely written in my *Second Plea for Peace*, *for Loyalty*, *and againſt Rebellion*; and all my Confutation of *Hooker*'s *Politicks*, in the Laſt Part of my *Chriſtian Directory*; with much more.

But this Book muſt have (if any) a Peculiar Anſwer.

V. Lately, when I taught my Hearers, *That we muſt not make the World believe, that we are under greater Sufferings, than we are, nor be unthankful for our Peace, and that we muſt when any hurt us, love and forgive them, and ſee that we fail not of our Duty to them; but not forſake the owning, and juſt defending by Scripture-Evidence the Truth oppoſed.* They Printed, that I *Bid the People Reſiſt, and not ſtand ſtill, and dye like Dogs.* And I was put the next Day to appeal to many Hundred Hearers, who all knew, that the Accuſation was moſt impudent Lies. This is our preſent Caſe.

VI. The Players, I hope, expect no Anſwer to their Part.

London, Printed for *R. Janeway*, in *Queens-Head-Alley*, in *Pater-Noſter-Row*, 1682.

The General Part containing the Design and Sum of this and the former Book, that it may be understood what it is that Mr. Morrice *defendeth, and opposeth; and what it is that I maintain or blame, and by what Evidence.*

§ 1. I Have been these forty years much troubled with the temptation to wonder, why God suffers most of the World to lie drown'd in Ignorance, Infidelity and Sensuality, and the Church of Professed Christians to live in so great Scandal, Contention, Division, and for the greater number, in a Militant Enmity against the Word, Will, Way, and Servants of Christ, while in Baptism they are Listed under him. But of late since Experience tells me of the marvelous Diversity of Humane Interests and Apprehensions, and the deep Enmity of the Fleshly Mind to Spiritual things, I admire the Wisdom and Providence of God, that there is so much Order, and Peace, and Love in the World of Mankind as there is: And that all men live not as in a continual War. And I perceive that if God had not preserved by Common Grace some remnants of Moral Honesty in the World, and had not also sanctified a peculiar People, whose New Nature is LOVE, the Sons of Men would have been far worse than Bears and Wolves to one another; and a man would have fled with greater fear from the sight of another man, than from a Snake or Tyger. But God hath not left himself without witness, in his Works, and daily Providences, and in the Consciences of those who have not sinned themselves into *Brutes* or *Devils*. And hence it is that there is some

Government and Order in the World, and that ſin is aſhamed of its proper name, and even they that live in Pride, Covetouſneſs, Ambition, Lying, Perſecution, *&c.* cannot endure to hear the name of that which they can endure to keep and practiſe, and cannot endure to forſake.

§ 2. And indeed it is a great Credit to *Honeſty* and *Piety*, to *Truth*, and *Love*, and *Peace*, and *Juſtice*, that the deadlieſt Enemies of them are ambitious of their *Names*; and though they will damn their Souls rather than be ſuch, they will challenge and draw upon any man that denieth them to be ſuch.

And I muſt profeſs, that I fetch hence a great confirmation of the Immortality of Souls, and a Future Life of Retribution. For if there were not a very great difference between Moral Good and Evil, what ſhould make all the world, even the worſt of men, be ſo deſirous to be accounted Good, and ſo impatient of being thought and called *naught*, and as they deſerve. And if the difference be ſo vaſt here, muſt there not needs be a Governour of the World that hath made ſuch a difference by his Laws and Providence, and who will make a greater difference hereafter, when the End and Judgment cometh.

§ 3. Among other Cauſes of Humane Pravity and Confuſion, one is the exceeding difficulty that young men meet with, in the communication of ſo much Knowledge as they muſt neceſſarily receive from others. Knowledge is not born with them: It is but the *power* and *capacity* of it, and not the *act* in which an Infant excels a Dog. And how ſhall they have it but by *Objects* and *Communication*? And *Objects* tell them not things paſt, the Knowledge of which is neceſſary to make them underſtand things preſent, and to come; and without which it is not poſſible to be wiſe. And God teacheth not Men now by Angels ſent from Heaven, but by Men that were taught themſelves before; and by his Spirit bleſſing mens endeavours. And when I have ſaid [*by Man*] how bad, how ſad a creature have I named? Alas! *David's* haſte *Pſal.* 116. was not erroneous paſſion; nor *Paul's* words, *Rom.* 3. a ſlander, when they called all men Lyers, that is untruſty; and ſo little do men know that muſt teach others, and ſo much doth all corruption incline them to love flattering Lies, and to take fleſhly Intereſt, the World, and the Devil for their Teachers, and to hate the Light, becauſe it diſgraceth their hearts and deeds, and ſo much goeth to make a man wiſe,

wiſe, that it muſt be a wonder of merciful Providence that ſhall help young men to Teachers that ſhall not be their Deceivers. There were ever comparatively few that were truly wiſe and truſty, and theſe uſually deſpiſed in the World.

§ 4. And how ſhould young men know who theſe are? This is the grand difficulty that maketh the Errour of the World ſo uncurable. It requireth much wiſdom to know who is wiſe, and to be truſted; who can well diſcern and value that Knowledge in another, which he is a ſtranger to himſelf? Experience tells us, that young unexperienced men do commonly receive that man's Opinions, 1. Who hath by nearneſs, or ſome accident the greateſt advantage in their eſteem and love: 2. Or his that ſpeaks moſt for their fleſhly Intereſt, and for that which they would have to be true: 3. Or his that hath the laſt word. It cannot be expected that they judge of any thing, beyond the advantage of their ſenſes, and the *Notitiæ communes*, according to Evidence of Truth, which muſt be received by long and ſerious ſtudy, and by willing honeſt minds, and by the help of antecedent Verities.

§ 5. In this therefore *Divine free Election* is very manifeſt; As in giving the Goſpel to ſome Nations in the World, when moſt others never have it, ſo in giving ſome young perſons the bleſſing of good Education, and Teachers, and chuſing for them that were unable to chuſe well for themſelves; as alſo in bleſſing the ſame helps to one, which are deſpiſed by another. And verily when I have been long ſtalled with the difficulties about *Election* and *Differencing Grace*, undeniable Experience hath been my chief Conviction. If the Goſpel be true, the common worldly fleſhly ſort, that are for Chriſt but by Tradition, Law and Cuſtom, and are religious for worldly ends, and no farther than the Intereſt of the Fleſh and World will give them leave, have no true *Saving* Grace at all. And the reſt that ſeriouſly believe and ſeek a better Life, and live above fleſhly worldly Intereſts, are in moſt places few, and made the ſcorn and hatred of the reſt. And if *de facto*, God do ſanctifie only a peculiar People, who can deny his differencing Will and Grace?

§ 6. I was my ſelf in my Childhood ignorant what Teachers among ſuch diverſity I ſhould prefer. And firſt God had ſuch a witneſs in my Conſcience, that Virtue and Holineſs were better than *Vice* and *Sin*, that it made me think that the ſort of

Teachers who Traded meerly for the World, and never ſpake a ſerious word of Heaven, nor differed from ſober Heathens, but in Opinion; yea, that endeavoured to make ſerious Godlineſs to ſeem but Hypocriſie, were not like to be the wiſeſt and moſt truſty men. And yet how to judge among the ſerious, which were right, was long too hard for me.

§ 7. When I came to conſider of the Diviſions of the Chriſtian World, and heard the Papiſts pretend to Catholiciſm, and call all others Schiſmaticks or Hereticks, it ſometime ſeemed a plauſible Opinion, that the greateſt Power and Dignity of the Clergy, was the Intereſt of Chriſtianity: By Riches, Honour and Power, they may protect the Godly, and keep Religion from Contempt among the worldly ſort of men, or from oppreſſion at the leaſt.

2. And I ſaw that in all Ages and Countries of the World, Hiſtorians tell us how rare a thing, a wiſe and holy Prince hath been, and how commonly by Wealth and Greatneſs they have been bred up in that Senſuality and Pride, which hath made them the Capital Enemies to ſerious Piety; if not the Perſecutors of it.

3. I thought with my ſelf if ſuch godly Chriſtians, as much value the Intereſt of Religion had lived in ſuch times and places, where Rulers were Perſecutors of the Truth, how glad would they have been to have had the Power of Church-matters put into the hands of their Choſen Paſtors, what would they have deſired more?

4. And I read that till Riches and honours were annexed to the Office, the People had ſtill the Choice of their own Paſtors, and therefore could not chuſe but wiſh their Eſtates and Lives, and all, as well as their Religion, to be as much as might be in their hands. And ſo no doubt when the Biſhops were advanced to great Dioceſſes, and Power, it was by the deſire of the moſt Religious Chriſtians, who valued moſt the Intereſt of the Church.

5. And I could not but obſerve, that though Chriſt gave his Apoſtles no Power of the Sword, he ſet them above other Miniſters, not only in Miraculous Gifts, and Infallible teſtifying and recording his Commands and works, but in ſome ſort of overſight, which ſeemeth a thing appointed for Continuance as well as preaching.

6. And I thought that if Church-Grandure were the Intereſt of Religion and Unity the ſtrength of the Church, it lookt very plauſibly

plauſibly to reaſon, that as Biſhops were over Presbyters, ſo there ſhould be ſome over Biſhops; and that National Churches ſhould by ſuch Government be hindered from Schiſm and Hereſie as well as Parochial. And that Dioceſans and Metropolitans Power ſhould be derived from a Superiour as well as Presbyters. And that when poor Subjects dare not reprove a Prince, ſome that are above fearing his Power may.

7. And when I read the Popes Claim, I thought it ſeemed not improbable, that *Petrus primus*, and *paſce oves meas*, and *ſuper hanc Petram* were not ſpoken in vain And theſe thoughts pleaded thus for Church-Grandeur in Prelates and Popes.

§ 8. On the other ſide, I ſaw 1. That Chriſt ſaid, His Kingdom *was not of this world, and comes not* μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, with obſervable Pomp. And that when they ſtrove who ſhould be *greateſt*, he reproved them, and Concluded [*with you it ſhall not be ſo*] and that the moſt ſerviceable is to be accounted the greateſt; that *Peter* himſelf accordingly deſcribeth their office, 1 *Pet.* 5.

2. I find that Chriſt appointed them another ſort of work to do, even to Preach the Goſpel to all Nations through all ſtreights, difficulties and ſufferings, and to baptize, and teach Chriſtians to obſerve the Laws of Chriſt. And that as he never put the Sword into their hand, ſo an official declaring and applying his Word to voluntary Diſciples was all their Office, as ordinary Paſtors to be continued.

3. I find that Chriſt ſent them out by two and two, as if it had been done on foreſight, that men would erect a Church-Monarchy: And that no Scripture tells us of any diviſion of the Church into Dioceſſes, where one Apoſtle was a Monarch, or had Power above the reſt, or was his Peculiar Province: Nor that the twelve ſettled twelve ſuch, or any as the ſeats of their Succeſſors.

4. I find not that ever any one Apoſtle exerciſed Government over the reſt: Nor that ever Chriſt gave the reſt any Command or Direction to obey any one; Nor that ever the Contending or Schiſmatical ſort of Chriſtians were directed to end their ſtriſe, by taking any one for the Head who muſt determine all their Controverſies: And that they that ſaid [*I am of Cephas*] are reproved with the reſt. And that all are called Members of the Body, and only Chriſt the Head. And if it had been his will that *One Univerſal Head* or *Power* ſhould have been ſet up as the *Principium*, or Center of Unity, it is a matter of ſo great

great conſequence, that it is not to be believed that Chriſt would not have plainly commanded it.

5. I find that Chriſt hath himſelf done the work, for which the neceſſity of *Univerſal Humane Government* (by Pope or Councils) is pretended; *viz.* He hath made and cauſed his Apoſtles (peculiarly qualified for it) to record Univerſal Church-Laws, even as many as are Univerſally neceſſary: And if ſo, I cannot but think, 1. That he hath done it better than Man can do; 2. And that to add more unneceſſarily muſt needs be a ſnare and burden to the Church; 3. And that it muſt be an uſurping the Power of Chriſt: For if there be no other Univerſal Governour, there is no other that hath Authority to make Univerſal Laws. Therefore this is Treaſon againſt Chriſt, and a making Man a Vice-Chriſt.

6. I found that there is not ſo much as a *Natural Capacity* in any one, or many, for an Univerſal Government: Church-Government being of ſuch a nature as maketh it far more impoſſible, than for one Monarch or Ariſtocracy to Govern all the Earth: And to do it by a truly General Council, or by the Diffuſed Biſhops of all the World is further from poſſibility than to do it by a Pope.

7. I ſearcht the Councils pretended to be General, to ſee whether they had made any better Laws than Chriſt's, or made any deſirable addition. And I found 1. That while they were not wholly Papiſts, they never pretended to make Canons for any Chriſtians, but only thoſe in the *Roman* Empire. 2. And that it had been much happier for the Churches if they had made no more Laws than Chriſt had made them, for holy Doctrine, Worſhip, and Church-Diſcipline, and had only as Teachers expounded and applied the Laws of Chriſt.

8. I conſidered the Preſent State of the Church Univerſal, and I find it ſuch as no Party of Chriſtians in the World doth own. The Pope pleadeth for an Univerſal Soveraignty, and all his Clergy do the ſame; ſome ſaying it is in Councils, ſome in the Pope, and moſt in both together, or Councils approved by the Pope: And Proteſtants, Greeks, Neſtorians, Jacobites, and almoſt all other Chriſtians in the World, accuſe this *Roman* Church and Claim.

The Papiſts condemn the reſt: The *Greeks*, *Arminians*, and almoſt all the reſt accuſe each other.

9. I considered what Popery is, that is, *Clergy-Power* in its height, and what it hath done in the World. And I found 1. A woful description of the lives of multitudes of Popes, recorded by their own most credited Historians. And 2. I found multitudes of vicious Canons obtruded by them as Laws on the Universal Church. 3. I found most doleful Histories of the Wars and Rebellions that they have caused from Age to Age. 4. I found that they have corrupted the Doctrine of Christ in abundance of particulars. 5. And that they have lockt up the Sacred Scriptures from the Vulgar, as they have not done their Canons. 6. And that they have turned God's Spiritual Worship into a multitude of Superstitious Rites, and scenical Ceremonies and Shews. 7. And that they have turned Spiritual Church-Discipline into a secular sort of Tyranny. 8. And that they have most schismatically unchurched the rest of the Churches, because they are not Subjects of the Pope. 9. And that they have branded the soundest Churches with the name of Hereticks, while they are the grand Heresie of the World. 10. And that they have been and are the greatest Silencers of sound Preachers, and hinderers of true Piety and Reformation in the Church. 11. And that they have wofully vitiated the People that are their Subjects, so that odious wickedness fed by Ignorance, abounds among them; and it is their Votaries that are called *Religious*, and a few Canonized persons Saints; as if Religion and Sanctity were rarities, or any could be saved without them. 12. Lastly, I find that they have lived upon Blood, like Leeches, and have been the cruellest Persecutors of holy men, on pretence of killing Hereticks: And that it is this to which they trust.

10. I took not this notice of them upon meer prejudice, but have read, I think, as many Papists Books, as Protestants, or any other against them. Nor have I taken it upon dark Scripture Prophecies, suspecting my understanding of them: But 1. The matter of fact from themselves: 2. Against their Papal Supremacy from such Arguments as are fully collected by Dr. *Barrow*. 3. Against their heinous Church-corruptions, from such Moral Evidence as Dr. *H. Moore* hath fully gathered in his *Mystery of Iniquity*. 4. Against their pretences of Tradition and Antiquity, I fetcht my Arguments from the Histories and Authors which they themselves alledge, and especially their Councils, with the Fathers Writings.

§ 9. Seeing

§ 9. Seeing the Church in this ſad Condition, and the Papal part ſo greatly vitiated, I conſidered how long it had ſo been. And I found that the Pope and his Biſhops grew not up like a Muſhroom in a day; but had been long in thriving to maturity: And I met with no man that could juſt tell what Year or what Age the diſeaſe or tumor did begin. Biſhop *Bramhall* thinks if they will abate their laſt 400 years Innovations, we may have hope of agreeing with them. Biſhop *Gunning* will own no General Councils, but the firſt ſix; ſome will receive eight; ſome but four. Mr. *Morrice* here goeth no further in his defence of them, whatever he think. Some begin Popery with *Leo* the great, ſome with *Gregory*'s Succeſſour. But it is moſt certain, that it was firſt an Embrio, and next an Infant and ſo grew up from Childhood to maturity by degrees. And the firſt Church-corruption was not that which we now call Popery. And it is as certain that the tumor did neither begin nor grow up in the Biſhop of *Rome* alone, but in other Biſhops, who grew up with him, & were his ſtrength and Councils, and he their Head.

§ 10. It is known when the *Greeks* and *Romans* began moſt notably to ſtrive which ſhould be greateſt, and how the diviſion increaſed, and when and how it came to an anathematizing or excommunicating each other.

§ 11. It's notorious that it was from the Councils of *Calcedon*, and *Epheſus*, that the great ſeparated bodies of *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* (now called *Jacobites*) that poſſeſs the *Eaſt* and *South*, were broken off with *Neſtorius* and *Dioſcorus*, and ſo continue to this day.

§ 12. I conſidered who were the Chief Authors of all theſe lamentable Schiſms, and Church-corruptions in the ſeveral Ages when they roſe, and who continue them to this day: And I found that many Princes were much to be blamed, and the People not Innocent, no not the Religious Monks. But the Biſhops that had the main Church-power, by abuſing it, were with their Clergy the principal Cauſes, and ſo are to this day: The breaches might yet be healed in Eaſt, Weſt, and South, were it not for them.

§ 13. Finding this in Hiſtory of undoubted Truth, I next conſidered what was the Cauſe that the Biſhops and their Clergy ſhould become ſuch Church-corrupters and Dividers, and ſtill continue the Churches miſeries.

And

And I found as followeth, 1. That none are able to do so much hurt as those that have the greatest *Parts, Power, Interest* and *Trust*. None kill so many (except Souldiers) as those Physicians who are entrusted to heal and save them. If five hundred neighbours mistake a man's Disease, whom he never trusted, it hurts him not: But an unskilful Nurse or Parent may kill a sick Child; and an unskilful or unfaithful Physician may kill multitudes.

2. And there goeth so much to make a man a skilful, faithful Pastor, as that such are rare. As a Physician is like to kill his Patient, if he mistake but some one thing in his Disease, or some Ingredient in his Medicine, though he were right in all the rest: So if a Guide of Souls were excellent in all other things, what work one Opinion, yea or unskilful word may make, not only the case of the *Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites*, &c. tell us, but even the strife that arose in the Church about *Hypostasis* and *Persona*, which had almost hereticated *Jerom* himself, for all his skill in the Languages: And the case of the Greeks and Latines about [*Filioq;*] and abundance such.

3. And *Pride* is the *Heart* of the Old Man; first living, and last dying. And *great Power, great Parts*, and *great Esteem* do feed it, if true Grace do not mortifie it. Knowledge puffeth up; and especially when men live among the ignorant and unlearned, and are but half Learned themselves, and are thought by the people and themselves, to be much wiser than they are: *Inter cœcos luscus Rex.*

4. And *Selfishness* is the very sum of all positive iniquity: And Pride and Selfishness make men desirous to be the Idols of the World, and to seem as Gods knowing good and evil, and to have their *will* of all that they have to do with.

5. And the strongest temptations use to cause the greatest sins.

§ 14. These Generals presupposed, it is most clear, 1. That the remnant of these sins, even in Christ's Apostles, set them on striving who should be greatest, and made *James* and *John* desire preheminence, and also to have called for *Fire* from Heaven; and made them after Christ's Resurrection, hope that he would have restored the Earthly Kingdom unto *Israel*. And it put *Paul* to vindicate his Apostleship against many that disparaged him; As it made *Diotrephes*, who loved to have the preheminence, to cast out the Brethren, and speak evil of *John*: It gave *Peter* occasion to warn the Bishops not to *Lord it over God's Heritage*,

but to be Examples to the Flock, overseeing them not by constraint, but willingly.

2. Even in good men this fault, though not in a reigning degree, did live more in others afterwards, that had not that measure of the Spirit as the Apostles had to overcome it. And if even in *Paul*'s daies he had none like-minded to *Timothy*, who naturally cared for the good of all; for all (too much) sought their own, and not the things that are Jesus Christ's, as *Demas* forsook him for some worldly Interest; what wonder is it if afterward Pride and Worldliness grew greater, and Heresies and Strifes increased.

3. Yet while Christianity was a suffering and laborious State, the Pastors of the Churches were commonly the best men, that had more Knowledge, Holiness and Love than others, and the Churches prospered under the Cross: They that spared not their labours, but imitated the pattern set by *Paul*, *Acts* 20. did not strive who should have the largest Dioceſs, and undertake that which they could not do, but they strove to do as much as they were able, and to increase and edifie the Flock.

4. But when extraordinary Gifts abated, and acquired Ones became more necessary, and few Philosophers turned Christians, able Taking Preachers or Orators grew fewer, and those few that were eminent in Knowledge and Speech were justly preferred before the rest. And usually some one man had the chief hand in converting men, and gathering a Church in each particular Town, and then he rightfully was taken for their Pastor: And it being found that the publick and private care of Souls required in each Church, where were fit men, more than one Pastor; 'It was not meet that more should be brought to him that 'was there before, without his approbation and consent; but that 'he were to the *Juniors* as a Father; And because the rest were usually below him in Gifts and Worth, it was thought but meet that they should do what they did by his consent: And also to avoid Divisions, to which they were over-prone, it was judged fit that one should have the preheminence, and a negative, and partly ruling Vote.

5. The Churches, which in the beginning had these Bishops and Fellow-Presbyters, were single Congregations: And shortly they grew to be more than could meet together in some few great Cities; Persecution hindering them from very large Assemblies,

ſemblies, beſides their want of large capacious Temples. Dr. *Hammond* thinks that there is no evidence, that in Scripture-time there were any other Presbyters than Biſhops, and conſequently a Biſhop had but one Congregation, unleſs he went one hour to one, and another to another, which was not their uſe. But doubtleſs in this he is miſtaken, as the many Speakers as *Corinth* ſhew.

6. The Greatneſs of the *Roman* Empire was prepared by God to be then an exceeding great furtherance of the Goſpel: For under the ſame Civil Laws and Powers, where one or two Languages were underſtood by moſt, Chriſtians had the far greater advantage for Communication. Want of forreign Languages is now our great hinderance from Preaching the Goſpel to other Nations of the World: And the Confuſion at *Babel* was an unſpeakable Judgment. But as Ships, yea Navies, can ſail on the Ocean, when ſmall Barks or Boats only can paſs on Rivers; ſo the vaſtneſs of the *Roman* Empire was a great help to the Church, by Communication, Language and Acceſſes: But eſpecially when the Emperour became Chriſtian, the advantage was exceeding great: Whereas now the Greatneſs of the *Turkiſh, Tartarian* & *Indoſtan* Empire, are great Impediments to the Goſpel; becauſe the *Barbarians* are more cruel Enemies than the Civil *Romans* (notwithſtanding the ten Perſecutions) were; and their oppoſition is the more extenſive by the extent of their Dominions; and the Chriſtian Churches having now more ſcandalized the Infidels by their corruptions. While they were not corrupted by worldly power and wealth, the great holineſs of the Churches convinced the ſober part of the Empire. *Albaſpineus* ſhews us clearly that their ſtrictneſs was ſo great, that they endured no notable ſcandalous ſin among them; yea and came very near to the *Novatians* in their Diſcipline: And that it was not for greater ſtrictneſs that the *Novatians* were condemned, but for denying the Power of the Church to abſolve men penitent that ſinned after Baptiſm. And their Canons ſhew it. And it is certain, that Chriſtians obeying *Paul*, avoided the Heathen Judicatures as much as might be, and cenſured thoſe that did not, and ended their Differences by the way of Arbitration, and took the Biſhop with the Conſent of his Clergy to be an Authorized Arbitrator; and thus the affairs of all the Chriſtians being caſt upon him, and he having no power to force any

man, but only to govern Volunteers, the Biſhops were conſtrained to make their Rules of Diſcipline ſo much the ſtricter, that all that would not renounce Chriſtianity, and Church-Communion, might be brought to Obedience to eſcape Excommunication.

7. God having made the *Great Power* and *Extent* of the *Roman* Empire, ſo great a means for the propagation of Chriſtianity, the Chriſtians thought that the *Greater* they grew themſelves, the more it would tend to the Churches deliverance, from contempt and perſecution: And their advancement lay in that advancement of the Biſhops, which private men could not expect, ſave only by ſubſequent participation. Hereupon the Biſhops, by the Peoples conſent, endeavoured to form the Government of the Church within the Empire, into a conformity to the Government of the Empire: And they contrived that thoſe Cities whoſe Governours had the chief Civil Power, their Biſhops ſhould have anſwerable Church-Power; the Glory of the Empire drawing them for ſeeming Intereſt, into imitation.

8. From the like Principles they deſired greatly the enlargement of the Churches of which they were Overſeers: And whereas Chriſt had made ſingle Churches like Schools, and every ſtated Worſhipping Church, was alſo a Governed Church, as every School hath its School-Maſters, one, or more; by degrees theſe Churches were by degeneration quite altered into other things: Firſt, They were like a Parochial Church, which addeth Chappels: They thought not ſo contemptibly of the Paſtoral work as we do, but found enough, as is ſaid, for many men in a Church of a few hundred or thouſand ſouls: And when by Perſecution, or Numbers, or Diſtance, they could not all meet ordinarily in one place, they appointed them to meet under ſeveral Presbyters, in ſeveral places, but without appropriating a particular Presbyter to each Aſſembly.

2. After they appropriated them to their diſtinct charges, and diſtinguiſhed a ſtated Worſhipping company from a Governed Church, the Biſhop and his Conſiſtory ruling all in common; and the People tyed to communicate only at the Biſhops Altar, and elſewhere to be but Hearers and Worſhippers.

3. After that they ſet up Altars up and down for Monuments and Memorials of Martyrs, and then in the Presbyters Chappels; yet ſo that the People were at *Eaſter*, *Whitſuntide*, and the *Nativity*,

tivity, to communicate with the Biſhop in the Mother Church or Cathedral.

4. Then when Country-Villages diſtant had a great increaſe of Chriſtians, they allowed Country-Biſhops, *Chorepiſcopos*, (proved by *Petavius* to be true Biſhops; if they were not, Presbyters ordained.) But they muſt be ſubject to the City Biſhop. 5. After this they decreed that very little Cities ſhould have no Biſhops, *ne vileſcat nomen Epiſcopi*; whenas before that every City had a Biſhop and Elders, that had Chriſtians enow: And every Town, like our Corporations, or Market-Towns, were called Cities: πόλις did not ſignifie only ſuch as we now call Cities diſtinct from ſuch Towns; were they no bigger than *Cenchrea*, *Majuma*, and ſuch others cloſe to greater Cities, they had Biſhops. Yea every Church was to have their Elders, (and conſequently Biſhops, ſaith Dr. *Hammond*) where ever it was, by the Rule of the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* 14. 23. And God never ſaid, Let there be no Churches but in Cities: Elſe when an Emperour would put down all the Cities, or many, he ſhould put down as many Churches.

6. After this they ſet up Patriarks as before they had done Metropolitans: And it was three that they firſt ſet up (but no where out of the Empire:) And the Papiſts find in the Inſtitution the myſtery of Trinity in Unity: For they could not find any where Twelve Seats Succeſſors to the Twelve Apoſtles; and ſo they feigned, that *Peter* being the Center of Unity, The Trinity flowed from him. 1. He as Biſhop erected the *Antiochian* Patriarchate. 2. By St. *Mark* his Diſciple, the *Alexandrian*. And 3. By his final Epiſcopacy the *Roman*, ſaith *Joh. Dartis, de ſtatu Eccleſ. tempore Apoſtoli*, pag. 23, 24. [*Imitatur Eccleſia Deum ut trinum in Perſonis & unum in eſſentia, quatenus ſcilicet una & eadem Eccleſia eſt multiplex ratione locorum; nam diſtributio prima & generalis omnium Eccleſiarum fuit in tres Patriarchatus, Romanum, Alexandrinum, & Antiochenum, ut unum eſſet per tres Antiſtites Sacerdotium ad Trinitatis inſtar cui una eſt atque individua poteſtas ut recte interpretatur Symmachus Pap. ad Eonium--- Dicendum eſt quod ſicut in Trinitate una exiſtente eſſentia, tamen perſonæ differentes exiſtunt, ita Eccleſia una eſt eſſentia, licet plures particulares exiſtant: Et ſicut omnes Trinitatis perſonæ originem ſumunt à Patre, qui eſt origo Filii, & uterque Sp. Sancti, ita Eccleſia origo eſt Romana aliarum.*]

7. After

7. At the ſame time they began to deſcribe Churches or Biſhops Provinces by the Meaſures of Land, which before were deſcribed by the Perſons of Volunteers, inhabiting near each other, ſaith the aforeſaid *Dartis* p.128. *Et ſane diu duravit ille mos tanquam Apoſtolicus in Eccleſiis, ut non eſſent alii termini Epiſcopatus quam multitudo eorum quos ad fidem convertiſſent & baptizaſſent*, which he proveth out of the Canons.

8. *Rome* being the imperial Seat, the Biſhop of *Rome* was neareſt the Emperour and ſubordinate Rulers, and ſo moſt capable to make Friends for Chriſtians under any Accuſations and Perſecutions; by which advantage all Chriſtians through the Empire needing and being glad of ſuch help, did willingly give the Primacy to the *Romane* Patriark.

9. The Emperor *Conſtantine* turning Chriſtian, and taking them for his ſureſt Souldiers, reſolved to raiſe them as high as he well could, for the intereſt of Chriſtianity and his own, and thereby to work down the Heathens by degrees, and accordingly gave them chief Countenance, and chief Power; and their Biſhops being their chief men, it muſt be done by exalting them. He made them the authorized Judges of all Chriſtians that deſired it, even in criminal caſes. He yet gave not the Biſhops the power of the Sword; but if any Chriſtians had committed Fornication, Adultery, Perjury, yea Murder, the Biſhop was to puniſh them by Pennance and Suſpenſion from the Sacrament: Beſides which, Chriſtians had the chief Preferments as they were capable of in the Armies and Civil Government: So that they triumphed over their late Perſecutors, And now Honour, Power and Wealth, were moſt on the Chriſtians ſide, but eſpecially the Biſhops.

10. Worldly Intereſt being now on the Churches ſide, much of the World by ſuch Motives crowded into the Church, and no man can imagine that it could be otherwiſe, who conſiders which way the Vulgar go, and how apt to be of the Prince's mind, and how much nature inclineth to fleſhly Intereſt: Who had not rather be kept from the Sacrament and Communion for a crime, till he profeſs Repentance, than to be hanged or baniſhed, or ruined for it?

But eſpecially the Temptation was ſtrongeſt to the Biſhops, whoſe baits were the moſt alluring: And ever ſince then they that moſt loved *Wealth*, *Power* and *Honour* (that is, the worſt, moſt worldly

worldly men) have been the moſt eager deſirers and ſeekers of Biſhopricks: And while humble holy men muſt rather be ſought to, ſuch earneſt ſeekers are like to be the ordinary finders and poſſeſſors.

11. But yet three things kept up for ſome time a conſiderable number of godly Biſhops in the Churches, which with the humble Presbyters, kept up the Intereſt of ſound and practical Religion.

1. Thoſe that had been tryed worthy men before *Conſtantines* converſion, and the Biſhop's exaltation, kept their Integrity in the main; though in the *Nicene* Council their contentious Libels ſhewed that we are more beholden to *Conſtantine* than to them, that they fell not into ſuch ſtrife as their Succeſſors did. Good men may be carryed too far in Pride and Strife, but they will not be maſtered by them, and turn againſt the Power of Godlineſs.

2. The People and Inferiour Clergy had the choice of their Biſhops: And ſo (though they oft had tumults, as in popular Elections it will be) yet the worſt ambitious men were long kept out, and the beſt oft choſen, till the People and Presbyters themſelves were corrupted.

3. And divers good Emperours aroſe that took ſome care to promote the beſt: But alas! this had ſad and frequent interruptions.

12. For the *Arians* poſſeſt *Conſtantine* himſelf with hard thoughts of *Athanaſius* and his Adherents: And it could not be expected that *Julian* ſhould countenance the beſt, when *Conſtantius* and *Valens* had done ſo much againſt them, and got moſt of all the Churches headed by *Arian* Biſhops; to ſay nothing yet of after times.

13. But now two things became matter of Contention among the Biſhops and their Clergy, and increaſed the ſtrife from time to time. The firſt and chief was the Old *Cauſe greatly* ſtrengthened, *viz. Who ſhould be greateſt?* Who ſhould have the largeſt, fatteſt, and moſt Ruling Dioceſs and Seat? The other was, *Who ſhould be taken for the moſt Orthodox, and whoſe Explications of the Faith ſhould be taken for the ſoundeſt*; eſpecially about the deſcription of the *Perſon* and *immanent acts of Chriſt*? Or briefly, 1. Juriſdiction and Greatneſs: 2. Wiſdom and hard words.

14. Now

14. Now also *Constantinople* contended with *Rome*, and being the Seat of the Empire which they judged to be the true Reason of Church-preheminence, they at first modestly took the second place: And now the Trinity of Patriarchs was turned to five, *Jerusalem* being made the fifth. At all this *Rome* grudged.

15. All this while the old Discipline of the Church was tolerably kept up; 1. Because though much of the world had got into the Church, yet a very great part were tenacious of their Heathenish Customs, and prejudiced against Christians by their Contentions, (odiously described by *Am. Marcellinus*, and many others, and prejudiced against *Constantine* for his Son *Crispus* and *Sopaters* death, &c. and against *Constantius* for the Murder of *Julian*'s Relations; and being taken with the plausible parts of *Julian*, and with the great Learning and highly extolled Lives of *Plotinus*, *Porphyrius*, *Jamblichus*, *Ædesius*, *Maximus*, *Proeresius*, *Libanius*, *Chrysanthius*, and such others, described by *Eunapius*, &c. so that except *Rome* and *Alexandria*, for 200 years, and some few of the very great Churches for 400, the Churches were no greater than one Bishop and his Consessus, might tolerably govern by the Keys. 2. And all this while all the Presbyters were Church-Governours as well as the Bishop, though he was their Chief, and all Excommunications were to be done by joint consent; And so many Church-Governours may do more than one.

16. Then Councils called General, having by the Emperours Grant, and the Clergies Desire and Consent, the Supreme Church-Power, it was in these Councils that the Pride, Ambition and Domination of all the worldly Prelates that were too soon got in, did exercise it self as the valour and wit of Souldiers in a field of War: And as 1. The good men yet among them; 2. And the Articles of Faith yet retained by them, did cause them to do much good against some Heresies and Disorders, so the Pride and Turbulency, yea ignorance of the rest, caused them to become the occasions of the doleful Schisms, and Heresies; and Enmity of Christians against each other, which continue to this day unhealed.

17. These hurtful Contentions in Councils at first prevailed but little, and that at *Nice* did much more good (I think) than harm: And after at *Constant*: a little more hurt was done, and much good: And those that followed did worse and worse, till the proud worldly Spirit contracted Malignity, and so much prevailed,

prevailed, that for a thouſand years at leaſt the Biſhops with their Prelatical Clergy and their Councils have been the grand Corruption and Plague of the Church; which many of the moſt Learned Expoſitors of the *Revelation*, take to be the *Image of the Beaſt*; and Dr. *H. Moore* calls it a *Heatheniſh Chriſtianity*, which they have made their Religion.

18. In their progreſs to all this, as the Dioceſſes firſt grew up from our Parochial Magnitude towards that of the preſent Dioceſan, ſo the very Paſtoral Power of all the reſt of the Presbyters, was by degrees taken away, ſo far as that they had no conſenting power in Ordinations or Excommunications, unleſs the Biſhop would chuſe a few for his Council: ſo that the proper power of the King's was confined to one Biſhop over many hundred Pariſhes; and ſo Diſcipline became an impoſſible thing, ſave as it ſerved the Biſhops againſt ſome that they diſliked: And ſo the Church which was as the Garden of Chriſt, became like the Commons, and good and bad were little differenced in Communion.

19. Yet becauſe the Power muſt ſtill be uſeful to the Biſhops ends, as he ſees cauſe, ſome ſhadow of the old exerciſe muſt be kept up: But the Biſhop having not leiſure for the tenth part of the labour which this very ſhadow required, Lay-men are made his Chancellours to decree Excommunications and Abſolutions, and to Govern by the Church Keys; like a ſecular Court: And Commiſſaries, Officials, Surrogates, and other hard names and things, are ſet up inſtead of the Presbyters and their Antient Office.

20. By this time the Antient Species of the Churches was altered; and whereas it was long held, that a Church and Biſhop were Correlates, and there were no more Churches than Biſhops, now many hundred or a thouſand Pariſhes are become no Churches, but parts of one Dioceſan Church, which is the loweſt, and many ſcore or hundred of the old ſort of Biſhops, all caſt out and ſwallowed up by one. Juſt as if a thouſand, or ſome hundred Schools ſhould have but one Governing Schoolmaſter, and be but one School, but each part have an Uſher to read to the Boyes, and tell the one Schoolmaſter as a Monitor what they did amiſs; but might correct none, nor put them out.

21. By this time they began to live on blood; and even as they ſwelled in the beginning, cruelty grew up equally with

Pride: For Reaſon and Scripture were not on their ſide, nor would juſtifie their Cauſe and them, and therefore violence muſt do it: They deſired not the bare title of *Power*, but the exerciſe of it, to promote the Iſſues of their *Wit* and *Will*. They began with raſh ſilencing, ejecting and depoſing Diſſenters, and thence to anathematizing them, and thence to baniſhing, till at laſt it grew up to tormenting in the Inquiſition, and burning them.

22. And whereas (notwithſtanding the petty Hereſies among Chriſtians too early) the glory of the Antient perſecuted Chriſtians was their entire Love and Concord, and the ſhame of the Philoſophers was their diſcord; it came to that paſs, that whereas a Hereſie of old did ſtart up among a few for a ſmall time, like our Ranters and Quakers, who ſhame Religion no more than Bedlams ſhame Reaſon: Now the great Continents of the Earth have been the Seats of the millions of thoſe called Hereticks and Schiſmaticks by each other, about 1400 or 1300 years. *Euſebius in Præpar. & Demonſtr.* copiouſly ſheweth that the Philoſophers were all confounded in diſſention (and yet did not perſecute each other) but that the Chriſtians were all of one Religion, cleaving to one Sacred Word of God: Of which alſo ſee *Raym. Breganitum in Theol. Gent. de Cogn. Dei, Enar.* 5. *cap.* 8. To be Lovers of good men, was the character of the old Biſhops: To be dividers, and haters, and ſlanderers, and ſilencers, and perſecutors, and murderers of them, grew up with corrupters Pride.

23. And with theſe did gradually grow up corruptions of Doctrine, even while they pretended a burning Zeal againſt Hereſie; and corruption of God's publick Worſhip, till it grew up to all the Maſs and *Roman* Impurities.

24. And to ſecure all this againſt Reformation, ridiculous Legends, and falſification of Church-Hiſtory, made it hard for poſterity what to believe, or whom.

§ 15. Being thus far ſure of the matter of fact, by what degrees Prelacy grew up to the height, that it hath now attained in the World abroad, I conſidered what men thought of it now at home (I am ſpeaking yet but of matter of fact;) and I found great diverſity in mens thoughts of it.

1. As to the *Roman* height, I found that the Church of *England* ſince the Reformation till A. B. *Laud*'s time took the Pope to be the Anti-

Antichriſt; It was in their Church-books: Many other Biſhops, as well as Biſhop *Downam*, have written for it: What Biſhop *Morton*, and *Hall*, and *Abbot*, and abundance ſuch have written againſt Popery I need not name.

2. I found that then the ſtream began to turn, and the name of Antichriſt was put out, and our Reconciliation with *Rome* was taken to be a hopeful work, and actually endeavoured (which by their converſion all good men deſire.)

3. I found that many among us of greateſt reverence and name had laid down ſuch tearms as theſe, "[That the Catho-"lick Church is one Viſible Society under one humane Govern-"ing Soveraignty: That this Univerſal Soveraign hath power of "Univerſal Legiſlation and Judgment: That the Colledge of "Biſhops through all the World, are this one Supreme Univer-"ſal Soveraign: That they exerciſe it in General Councils when "they ſit: That every Biſhop is by Office the Repreſentative "of his Dioceſan Church; and theſe Biſhops may, or muſt have "Metropolitans and Patriarchs; and by theſe Patriarchs and "Metropolitans *per literas formatas*, and their *Nuntii the Uni-"verſal Supreme Colledge may exerciſe their Power over all the "World*: And what they do thus, the Church or Colledge doth, "in the intervals of General Councils: That the Pope of "*Rome* is to be acknowledged the *Principium Unitatis* to this "Univerſal Church and Colledge of Biſhops, and the Ordinary "Preſident of General Councils *ex Officio*. That Councils called "without the Preſident who hath the ſole power, are unlawful "Aſſemblies, and puniſhable Routs. That the approbation of "the Preſident, (if not of the moſt of the Patriarchs) is the "note by which an authoriz'd obliging Council is to be known "from others. That the Pope is to be obeyed accordingly as "Prime Patriarch, *Principium Unitatis*, Preſident of General "Councils, and Patriarch of the Weſt. That all that will not "unite with the Church of *Rome* on theſe tearms, are Schiſma-"ticks, and ſo to be accounted and uſed. That thoſe that thus "unite with the Church of *Rome*, are no Papiſts: But a Papiſt "is only one that holdeth all to be juſt and good that is done "by Popes, or at leaſt one that is for the Pope's Abſolute "Power of Governing above Canon-Laws and Church-Parlia-"ments or Councils. And that if they will but abate their laſt "400 years Innovations, or at leaſt not impoſe them on others,

" we may unite with the Church of *Rome*, though they claim " as *Peter's* Succeſſors, the Univerſal Supremacy at leaſt to be "exerciſed according to the Canons of Councils. And that it "is not the Church of *Rome*, but the Court of *Rome*, which at " preſent we may not unite with. That the Church of *Rome* is " a true Church, and hath had an uninterrupted Succeſſion, and " its Sacraments true Sacraments: But none of thoſe Proteſtant " Churches are true Churches, that have not Dioceſan Biſhops; " nor any of their Paſtors true Miniſters of Chriſt, who have not " Dioceſan Epiſcopal Ordination; nor any that have ſuch, unleſs " it hath as ſuch been conveyed down from the Apoſtles by un- " interrupted Succeſſion by ſuch Dioceſans. That ſuch men have " no true Sacraments, God not owning what is done by any not " ſo ordained: That therefore they have no Covenant-promiſe " of, or right to Pardon and Salvation, becauſe ſuch right is " given only by the Sacrament: That therefore all ſuch Pro- " teſtants Sacraments are but nullities, and a prophanation of " holy things: And that the Holy Ghoſt being the Inſtituter of " theſe ſacred things, it is the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt to under- " take and exerciſe the Miniſtry, & celebrate Sacraments without " ſuch uninterrupted ſucceſſive Ordination. That an Ordained "Miniſter, hath no more power than was intended him by his " Ordainers: That in ſuch Presbyterians, or Epiſcopal Churches, " which have their power from the Ordainers, and ſo far for want " of Succeſſion, are nullities; it is ſafe for men (as *e. g.* in *France*) " to be rather of the *Roman* Church than theirs.

§ 16. And as I found this Doctrine in the aſcendent in *England*, ſo I met with ſuch as were for uſing Proteſtants accordingly, even for the ſilencing of them by thouſands, if they would not ſwear, profeſs, promiſe, and do all that —— And for uſing the People accordingly. And abating neither big nor little, an Oath or a Ceremony to unite or ſave them. And I lived in an Age where theſe things were no idle ſpeculations.

§ 17. Being thus far ſure of the Matter of Fact, I ſtudied as well as I was able to know which of theſe waies was right: And I ſaw that either Popery that is, the Popes univerſal Headſhip or Government is of Divine Inſtitution, or elſe it is a heinous Uſurpation, and formeth a ſort of Church which is not on any pretence of Concord to be owned. And as to the firſt I have ſaid before and in many Books what I have to ſay againſt it; which

is

is all ſummed up in Doctor *Iz. Barrow*, and Doctor *H. Moore*, and largely told the world by *Chamier*, *Sadeel*, *Whitaker*, *Jewel*, *Uſher*, *Morton*, *White*, *Chillingworth*, *Crakenthorne*, and abundance more. And I thought it ſtrange if either Papacy, or that Tympanite of the Clergy which tended to it, were of God, that the Perſons ſhould be ordinarily ſo bad, and it ſhould introduce ſo great miſchief in doctrine, worſhip and practice over the Chriſtian world, and bring the Church into ſuch a divided and polluted ſtate, and that as the Clergy ſwelled the Body ſhould pine away, and the Spirit of holineſs and Love be turned into the Skelleton of Ceremony and Formality, and into hatred, cruelty, and tearing and tormenting pains.

§ 18. Upon all ſuch thoughts I concluded in theſe reſolutions; 1. That I muſt not accuſe any Office made by God, for mens abuſe of it. 2. Nor muſt I accuſe the good for the faults of the bad. 3. Nor Confound the Office it ſelf, with its diſeaſe, and the accidental Tympanite. 4. Nor aggravate humane infirmities in good men, as if they were the crimes of malignant Enemies. 5. Much leſs lay any of the blame on Chriſtianity or Piety, when nothing in the world is ſo much againſt all theſe Evils, nor would they have been ſo far limited, reſtrained or reſiſted, had it not been for that Chriſtianity and Piety that was kept up againſt it; nor is there any other cure of it. It is not by Religion, but for want of more true and ſerious Religion, that all theſe miſchiefs have ſo lamentably prevailed.

§ 19. I therefore reſolving to avoid extreams, concluded thus; 1. That it is moſt certain that Chriſt is the only Head of the Church.

2. And that as ſuch he himſelf did make univerſal Laws, and will be the final univerſal Judge, and there is no other that hath univerſal Legiſlative and Judicial Power but he.

3. As ſuch he inſtituted neceſſary Church-Officers; firſt, extraordinary ones to be his Inſtruments in Legiſlation, as *Moſes* was to the Jews, giving them his Spirit extraordinarily for that uſe, to bring all that he taught them to their remembrance, and guide them to deliver and record all his Commands: And ordinary Miniſters (as the Prieſts and Levites to the Jews) to teach and apply theſe Commands, or univerſal Laws, to the end of the World, but not to add, diminiſh or alter them.

4. That the formal Eſſence of this continued Sacred Miniſtry conſiſteth

conſiſteth in a derived *Power* and *Obligation* in ſubordination to Chriſt as Prophet, Prieſt and King, to Teach, to Guide the Churches in holy Worſhip, and to Rule them by the Paſtoral Power, which maketh them Miniſterial Judges of mens capacity for Church-Communion; but they have as ſuch no forcing power of the Sword.

5. That there are two ſorts of theſe Miniſters accidentally diſtinguiſhed: 1. Such as are only ordained to the Miniſtry in general, and not ſpecially related to any one particular Church more than other; whoſe work is to do their beſt to Teach Infidels, and baptize them, and gather Churches, and occaſionally to Officiate orderly in ſuch Churches where they come as need their help. 2. Thoſe that have moreover an additional call to be the ſtated Paſtors, Overſeers or Guides of particular Churches as fixed Officers of Chriſt. All which have the three foreſaid Eſſentials of the Office, to Teach, Worſhip and Rule.

6. That the Office of theſe men is to be performed by themſelves, and no Lay-man may do any Eſſential part of them by their deligation, and therefore (as in Phyſicians, Tutors, &c.) neceſſary Perſonal abilities are as eſſential as the neceſſary *diſpoſitio materiæ* is *ad receptionem alicujus formæ*. And *ex quovis ligno non fit mercurius*.

7. That it is very much, and great, and moſt important work, which theſe Miniſters have to do. To Preach God's Word underſtandingly, faithfully, conſtantly, fervently; to reſolve the doubtful, to reprove the ſcandalous, to perſuade the obſtinate, to confute gainſayers, to comfort the ſad, and ſtrengthen the weak, particularly as there is occaſion. To viſit the ſick, Catechize, Baptize, beſides all acts of publick Government. Therefore one man cannot poſſibly do all this for too great a number of ſouls, but great Congregations muſt have many Miniſters: And ſo they had in the Primitive Church, where the moſt able Speakers preacht uſually in publick, and the reſt did more of the perſonal and more private work.

8. And whereas it was very early that moſt ſingle Churches had one that had a preheminence amongſt the reſt (not as of another Office, but as a Preſident in a Colledge of Philoſophers, Phyſicians or Divine Students, to be a Governour over thoſe of his own profeſſion, by moderate Guidance,) and it is not unmeet, that when one worthy Teacher hath gathered a Church,

and

and brought up younger Christians to Ministerial abilities, that they when they are ordained should take him for their Father, I will never gainsay such an Episcopacy in single Churches (that is, societies of Christians combined for personal Communion in Doctrine, Worship and Holy living under such Pastors as aforesaid.)

9. And because I find that the Apostles and Evangelists had a Ministerial care of many Churches to teach, reprove, exhort the Pastors and People; And though the Apostles extraordinary power and work ceased, yet *Church-Oversight* as well as Preaching being an ordinary continued work; and when I find Christ hath instituted some Teachers over many Churches, I dare not say that he hath repealed this till I can prove it. And the nature of the thing tells us, that if some grave holy men have the care of counselling and warning and reproving the Ministers of many Churches who are below them in parts and worth; It may do much good and can do no harm to the Churches, while they have no power of force or tyranny, Therefore I resolved never to speak or do any thing against such Bishops of Bishops, though Diocesan.

§ 20. Thus far I have oft declared my self for Episcopacy: But finding in all the aforesaid History, how the Church came to the woful State that it hath been in these 1200 years, and what it suffereth by the Bishops and their Clergy in almost all parts of the Christian World; and that even the *English* Dioceſans can endure no more Parochial Pastoral Discipline than they do, (I mean such as *Bucer in Script. Anglic.* preſt so vehemently on King *Edw.* and the Bishops) and that they cannot contentedly hold their Lordships, Wealth and Honours, without silencing and ruining Two thousand such as I, or better; and using many thousands of godly Christians as they do; and finding that I and such others are accused as being disobedient to them---- and for not swearing and covenanting never to endeavour any alteration of their present Church-Government, and all excommunicate by the Canon that say there is any thing in it (even from the Archdeacon downward to [*the rest in Office*] *repugnant to the Word of God*) I took it at last to be my duty to give the Reasons of my dissent in a full Treatise of Episcopacy.

And because I perceived young men and strangers to former times, deceived by the general noise, *How Antient and Univer-*

Univerſal Epiſcopacy hath been; as if all that is called *Epiſcopacy* were but one and the ſame thing; or as if we were againſt the Primitive Epiſcopacy; therefore I ſuddenly (and too haſtily for want of time,) beſtowed a few weeks in ſumming up the Heads of the Hiſtory of Biſhops and Councils, out of a few Hiſtorians which were moſt common, next at hand, and of moſt credit with thoſe whoſe faults I opened: That it might be truly known *How much the tumified degenerate ſort of Prelacy had cauſed the Diviſions and Calamities of the Church.*

§ 21. For this Mr. *Morrice* (as fame ſaith) and many more are ſo greatly offended with me, and ſay of me herein what they do. And on pretence of *Vindicating* the *Primitive Church* which untruly implyeth that I who vindicated it againſt corrupters did oppoſe it) he defendeth the corruptions and ſinful miſcarriages and diſeaſes of the Prelates: And this he doth, 1. By ſtriving to make me contemptible as *unlearned*, as if that would excuſe the ſins which I rehearſe and lament: He findeth in one place through my haſte and heedleſneſs, a word of *Theodoret* miſplaced, and the word [*Calami*] tranſlated *Quills*, which he thinks ſhould be *Reeds*; and one or two more ſuch; as if he prevaricated, and had a deſign to extol the Book, which he finds no more and greater fault in, than he really hath done. And he proveth it likely that I never ſaw the Hiſtories that ſtood by me near twenty years, becauſe the Printer put a Comma between [*Marquardus*] and [*Freherus*] (I think there are a dozen Comma's miſplaced in my whole Book;) when he himſelf ſaith of his own Book [*The faults that have eſcaped are almoſt infinite.*] But of theſe things more anon.*

2. He loudly and frequently chargeth me with malicious falſifying Hiſtory; and when he cometh to the proof, I have ſhewed you who the falſifier is.

3. The great thing I am accuſed of, is making the Biſhops more the cauſes of Hereſie, Schiſm and Violence, than they were: And of that I have ſaid nothing, but what I think I have fully proved: And let the Reader judge by this following Catalogue.

Domineering Pride hath been the chief cauſe of Hereſies and Schiſms, eſpecially working in the Clergy to tumid Prelacy and Tyranny.

I. I before noted how the Apoſtles began to ſtrive who ſhould be greateſt, till the effuſion of the Spirit after Chriſts rebukes had

had cured them. And what tiranny *Diotrephes* uſed through love of Preheminence.

II. If the doubtful ſtories of *Simon Magus* be true, his tumor was more than Papal; And *Epiphanius makes Menander, Saturnilus, Baſilides,* to be but his Off-ſpring. The Original of the *Nicolaitans* and *Gnoſticks* (who *Epiphanius* ſaith, had enſnared himſelf once) is utterly uncertain; *Carpocras, Cerinthus, Ebion, Valentinus, Secundus, Ptolomæus,* were all but Birds of the ſame *Gnoſticks* Neſt, a crazed ſort of men that mingled Chriſtianity, Platoniſm, and Magical Imaginations; and what they were themſelves, is not known: Such was *Marcus, Colarbaſus, Heracleon,* the *Ophitæ,* the *Cainites,* the *Sethians, Cerdo; Marcion* was a Biſhop's Son caſt out for vice; and *Lucian, Apelles* and *Severus* his Off-ſpring, the Heads of their little Sects; whether Biſhops or not, is unknown. What kind of Hereticks *Tertullian, Tatianus,* and *Origen* were, and how many faults as foul *Lactantius,* and many not numbered with Hereticks have, is well known: And among all theſe in thoſe early daies, till there were Popes and Dioceſans (ſuch as now) in the world, none ſuch could be Hereticks.

III. Many Councils contended about the time of *Eaſter,* and *Victor* with one part of Biſhops, excommunicated *Polycrates* and the *Arian* Biſhops; while, as *Socrates* and *Sozomen* tell us, the Churches that left it indifferent had peace.

IV. A Council of the beſt Biſhops at *Carthage* decreed Rebaptizing.

V. A Council of the Biſhops of *Cappadocia, Cilicia, Galatia,* &c, at *Iconium,* for Rebaptizing thoſe Baptized by Hereticks: And *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* excommunicated them all.

VI. A Council at *Synadis,* and divers others decreed the ſame Rebaptizing.

VII. Divers more *African* Councils of good Biſhops with *Cyprian,* decree the ſame, whom *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* condemneth.

VIII. Divers Biſhops are ſaid to be *Sabellian* Hereticks.

IX. *Paulus Samoſatenus* Biſhop of *Antioch* was a Heretick.

X. The Council of Biſhops at *Cirta* in *Numidia* under *Secundus* Mr. *M.* calls worſe than I do.

XI. A *Carthage* Council of 70 Biſhops *An.* 306. ſet up the *Donatiſts* Schiſm, ſtriving for the preheminence, who ſhould be Biſhop of *Carthage.*

XII. *An.* 308. Another *Donatists* Council had 270 Bishops. Many more Councils they had.

XIII. The first General Council at *Nice* we honour, and assent to its Creed: But thank *Constantine* for burning all their Libels, and keeping peace by his presence and speech.

XIV. The Schism made by *Meletius* and *Peter*, Bishops, is well known.

XV. The Heresie of *Arius* (a Presbyter that would have been a Prelate) quickly infected *Eusebius Nicomed.* if not *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, and divers other Bishops.

XVI. *Epiphanius* saith, that *Audius* was driven to his Heresie by being long abused, beaten, and at last excommunicated for reproving the Bishops and Priests for their Covetousness, Luxury, and other sins: And so he became a Bishop himself.

XVII. *Eusebius Nicom.* made Bishop of *Constantinople* (whom you tell us *Valesius* thinks was no Heretick) hired a Whore at *Antioch*, to father her Child on *Eustathius* the Bishop there, and got more Bishops to depose him, and the Emperour to banish him.

XVIII. A Council of Bishops at *Tyre* unjustly condemn and persecute *Athanasius*.

XIX. Three Bishops (saith Mr. *M.* overcome with too much Wine and persuasion) ordained *Novatian* falsly Bishop of *Rome* (before this aforementioned.)

XX. A Council at *Jerusalem An.* 335. tryed and approved *Arius* Faith, and restored him.

XXI. A Council at *Constantinople* condemned *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and *Athanasius*, and justified *Arius*.

XXII. A Council of near 100 Bishops at *Antioch*, 36 being *Arians*, deposed *Athanasius*.

XXIII. Another Council at *Antioch* make a new Creed without [ὁμοούσιον.]

XXIV. A Council of 376 Bishops at *Sardica*, decree Appeals to *Rome*, which *Augustin* and the *African* Bishops were against.

XXV. The *Semi-Arian* Bishops went to *Philippopolis*, and condemned such as the other at *Sardica* had absolved, but cast out [ὁμοούσιον] as not scriptural, and cast dreadful accusations on *Athanasius*, *Paulus C. P.* and *Marcellus*.

XXVI. *An.* 350. A Council at *Milan* received *Ursacius* and *Valens*, *Arians*.

XXVII. *Stephen*

XXVII. *Stephen* an *Arian* Biſhop hired a Whore to go in to Biſhop *Euphratas*; and this *Euphratas* after turned *Photinian*.

XXVIII. *An.* 353. A Council at *Arles* condemn *Athanaſius*.

XXIX. *An.* 355. A General Council at *Milan* of above 300 Weſtern Biſhops (though the Eaſtern that were moſt *Arian* could not come) where *Athanaſius* was condemned, and communion with the *Arians* ſubſcribed.

XXX. *An.* 356. A Council at *Byterris* condemned and baniſhed *Hilary*, and condemned them as Separatiſts or Schiſmaticks that renounced the *Arian* Communion.

XXXI. A General Council at *Sirmium* of 300 Weſtern Biſhops beſides the Eaſtern, made three different Creeds, condemned *Athanaſius*, left out the word [Subſtance] made *P. Liberius*, and old *Oſius* ſubſcribe againſt *Athanaſius*.

XXXII. The Oriental Biſhops at *Ancyra* were only for [ὁμοίωσις] and not [ὁμοούσιον] and with *Macedonius* againſt the Godhead of the Holy Ghoſt.

XXXIII. A General Council 400 Biſhops met at *Ariminum*; of whom moſt at firſt were Orthodox; but after when the Emperour interpoſed, ſubſcribed to the *Arian* Party.

XXXIV. The reſt ſate at *Seleucia*, and were more Orthodox, but divided into *Acacians*, who were for leaving out [*Subſtance*] and *Semi-Arians*, who were for [*Like Subſtance.*] *Sulp. Severus* tells us, that many Biſhops quieted their Conſciences by [*ſubſcribing in their own ſenſe*] and ſo deceived the *Arians* that thought they had won them.

XXXV. A Council at *C. P.* made a Ninth Creed, leaving out [*Subſtance* and *Hypoſtaſis*, The *Semi-Arians* for this baniſhed the Authors.

XXXVI. A Council at *Antioch* caſt out *Miletius*, and made a Tenth Creed, worſe than the reſt.

XXXVII. *Julian* Reigning, *Athanaſius* calls a Council at *Alexandria*, which had almoſt divided Eaſt and Weſt about the names [*Hypoſtaſis* and *Perſona*;] but that ſome wiſe men perſuaded them that the words were both of the ſame ſignification; which yet was hardly entertained afterward.

XXXVIII. A Council at *Antioch* of *Semi-Arians* Petitioned *Jovianus* to caſt out the *Acacians*; till they knew his mind, and then the *Arian* Biſhops turned Orthodox.

XXXIX. At a Synod in *Tyana Euſtath. Sebaſt.* denied [ὁμοούσιον] and the Godhead of the Holy Ghoſt.

XL. An *Arian* Council of Biſhops in *Caria* under *Valens*: And another at *Singeduni* in *Miſia*.

XLI. *Damaſus* in a *Roman* Council condemneth *Siſinnius* for Conventicles: For at the Election in the Church they fought for theſe two: And *Damaſus* his Party one day left 137 dead bodies behind them, and got the better.

XLII. *Valens* by cruelty ſet up *Arian* Biſhops in a great part of the Eaſt.

XLIII. The firſt General Council at *C. P.* is commonly called the Second General, when yet that at *Sardica*, *Ariminum*, *Sirmium*, *Milan*, were General alſo: They were many good men, and did good: But how they uſed *Nazianzen* to the great grief of the Church of *C. P.* and how *Nazianzen* deſcribeth them, I deſire the Reader to take from his own words, and not from mine, or Mr. *M.*

XLIV. The Council at *Cæſar Auguſta* did that which made *Martin* ſeparate from them and all their Councils after to his death.

XLV. A Council at *C. P.* ſet up *Flavian* at *Antioch*, and a Council at *Rome* were for *Paulinus*: The former advance *C. P.* and *Jeruſalem*.

XLVI. Many Schiſmatical Councils of *Donatiſt* Biſhops followed.

XLVII. For *Theophilus* caſe I refer you to *Socrates* and *Sozemene*.

XLVIII. *Epiphanius* his Schiſmatical uſage of *Chryſoſtom* is unexcuſable.

XLIX. And ſo is *Theophilus* proſecution of him, and a Synod of Biſhops caſting him out, and *Cyril's* reſiſting the reſtoring of his name when dead, and reviling the *Joannites* that kept ſeparated Meetings for his ſake.

L. The *Dioſpolitan* Council abſolved *Pelagius*. Divers *Carthage Councils* condemned him. P. *Innocent* condemned him. *Zoſimus* once abſolved him, and condemned his accuſers.

The Biſhops caſt out for Simony, I will not number here.

LI. The Contentions between *Boniface* and *Eulalius*, and others after them to get the Biſhoprick of *Rome*, are ſo many as I will not number them. And the ſtriving of three Biſhops ſucceſſively againſt the *African* Fathers for the *Roman* ſuper-eminence and Appeals to *Rome*, are commonly known.

LII. One

LII. One of Biſhop *Boniface's* Decrees is, That [*No Biſhop ſhall be brought before any Judge, Civil or Military, either for any Civil or Criminal Cauſe.*]

LIII. What the firſt General Council at *Epheſus* did in the Cauſe of *Neſtorius* I have fully opened: *Derodons* Evidence is undeniable, that *Neſtorius* was Orthodox as to the Matter, though he miſtook as to words, in thinking that Mary ſhould not be called *The Mother of God*, but of *Chriſt who is God.* (which *Luther* alſo ſhews.) Yet ſince that Councils anathematizing him, a great body of Chriſtians in many Eaſtern Kingdoms, to this day are a party hereticated by the reſt. Is not ſuch an effect of 1200 years continuance, a witneſs of the failing of that Council?

LIV. The Biſhops of *C. P.* and *Alexandria* ſtriving which ſhould be greateſt, a Council at *C. P.* decided it for *C. P.* where *Theodoret* was for *Alexandria*, and fell under *diſpleaſure*.

LV. *Leo M.* Biſhop of *Rome*, claims the title of *Head of the Catholick Church*.

LVI. Two Councils at *C. P.* one againſt *Eutyches* and the other for him.

LVII. The ſecond Council at *Epheſus* is ſo heavily accuſed by Mr. *M.* and ſuch others, that I need not accuſe it more. *Flavianus* of *C. P.* was there hurt to death. Yet *Bellarmin* confeſſeth it wanted nothing of a true General Council but the Pope's approbation.

LVIII. A Council at *Alexandria* under *Dioſcorus* excommucateth *Leo*.

LIX. What the Council of *Calcedon* hath done I have ſhewed: Inſtead of reconciling the *Neſtorian* and *Eutychian* Controverſies by a skillful explication of their ambiguous unfit words, they *Anathematized* both and baniſhed *Dioſcorus*, And ever ſince to this day, the *Eutychians* and *Neſtorians* are ſeparated Diſſenters.

LX. At *Alexand.* the Biſhops party that the Council was for (*Proterius*) and *Timothy* whom *Dioſcorus* party were for, ſo raged, that they murdered *Proterius*, and dragg'd his carkaſs in the ſtreets, and bit his fleſh: And each party ſtill accuſed the other.

LXI. *Pulcheria* (*Theodoſius*'s Siſter and *Martian*'s Wife) being for the Council, and *Eudocia Theodoſius*'s Widdow for *Dioſcorus*, they animated the ſeveral Parties of Biſhops and Monks: And in *Paleſtine Juvenal* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* was expelled, *Severianus* Biſhop of *Schythopolis* killed, &c.

LXII. *Leo*

LXII. *Leo* the Emperour commanding obedience to the *Calcedon* Council, at *Alexandria* and *Antioch* the Armies of contending Biſhops were in continual war, calling each other *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians*; one Biſhop baniſhed by the Emperour, the contrary Biſhop murdered by the people, and caſt into the River; the next getting the better again, *&c.*

LXIII. In *Martian*'s and *Leo*'s daies moſt Biſhops ſubſcribed to the Council. When *Baſiliſcus* uſurped, and was againſt the Council, ſaith *Niceph.* three Patriarchs, and five hundred Biſhops renounced it, moſt before having damned its adverſaries. *Baſiliſcus* recanteth his Commands, and commandeth all to be for the Council, and the Biſhops obey him, ſave thoſe of *Aſia*. *Zeno* recovereth the Empire, and is for the Council, and the *Aſian* Biſhops turn for it, and ſay they ſubſcribed to *Baſiliſcus* at firſt for fear. *Zeno* ſeeing it impoſſible otherwiſe to make Peace, leaveth all indifferent whether they will ſubſcribe the Council or not. Then the War grew hotter between the Biſhops and their Armies againſt each other, ſpecially the Patriarchs; all being in Confuſion, at *Alexand. Antioch* and *C. P.* and no Emperour wiſe enough to quiet them.

LXIV. *Anaſtaſius* a peaceable man, made Emperour, leaveth all to think of the Council as they will: Then the Biſhops fall into three Parties; ſome for every word in the Council; ſome anathematizing it, and ſome for the indifferency: The Eaſt one way, the Weſt another, and *Lybia* another; yea each Country divided among themſelves: Saith *Niceph. So great confuſion and blindneſs of mind befell the whole World.* The Emperour falls upon the impeaceable of both ſides: At his own place *C. P.* the Sedition of the People overcame him, for their Council Biſhop, which turned the Emperour more againſt the Council, and that Biſhop and the reſt.

LXV. At *Antioch* the Armies of two Biſhops fought it out, and the Council Party getting the better, killed ſo many Monks, as to ſave the labour of burying them, they caſt their bodies into the River: And after another Party of them made as great a ſlaughter. For this blood the Emperour baniſh'd *Flavianus* the Council Biſhop: This was called Perſecution. *Pet. Alex.* being dead, the Biſhops of *Alex. Egypt* and *Lybia*, fell all into pieces among themſelves, and had ſeparate Meetings: The reſt of the Eaſt ſeparated from the Weſt, becauſe the Weſt refuſed Communion with them,

them unleſs they would anathematize *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, *Dioſcorus*, *Moggus*, and *Acacius*: And yet ſaith *Niceph. Quigermani Dioſcori & Eutychetis ſectatores fuere, ad maximam paucitatem redacti ſunt.* Note that *Flavian* the Council Biſhop for fear with his Fellow-Biſhops (threatned by Biſhop *Xenaias*) ſubſcribed an Anathema againſt *Theodore*, *Theodorite*, *Ibas*, as *Neſtorians*: The *Iſaurian* Biſhops yield to anathematize the Council. *Severus* a fierce Enemy of the *Neſtorians* made Patriarch at *Antioch*, forced many Biſhops to renounce the Council; and many to fly. The *Iſaurian* Biſhops repent and condemn *Severus*: The Emperour commanded out two Biſhops for condemning their Patriarch: The People defend them, and force the Emperour to deſiſt, becauſe he would ſhed no blood for Biſhops. *Helias* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, ſaw all the Biſhops in ſuch confuſion, that he would communicate with none of them, but the Biſhop of *C. P.* The Monks at *Jeruſalem* proclaim *Anathema* to all that *equal not the four Councils to the four Evangeliſts, and write to the Emperour that they would make good the conflict to blood,* and went about to engage men to the Council: The Emperour commanded the Biſhop to reform this: He refuſeth. The Emperour ſendeth Souldiers to compel them, and the Biſhops and Monks forcibly caſt them out of the Church. He ſent *Olympius* with a ſtronger band, who caſt out the Biſhop: The next Biſhops and more Souldiers had yet more conflicts after this, and the Souldiers driven away by force.

LXVI. *Felix* of *Rome*, with 77 Biſhops, excommunicate *Acacius* of *C. P.* (with a [*Nunquam Anathematis vinculis exuendus*) and their own two Biſhops that obeyed the Emperour in communicating. The Schiſm between *Laurentius* and *Symmachus*, came to blood-ſhed, when five or ſix Councils laboured to heal it. *Symmachus* excommunicateth the Emperour and Biſhop of *C. P.* as communicating with Hereticks; but not an *Arian* King then at *Rome*.

LXVII. A Council of 80 Biſhops at *Sidon* anathematize the Council of *Calcedon*.

The ſtriving Parties keep up ſtill in great Bodies, and the *Melchites* (as they call thoſe that obeyed Kings and the Council) have one Patriarch at *Damaſcus*, the *Eutychian Jacobites* one at *Meſopotamia*, the *Maronites* one at *M. Libanus*, all called Patriarchs of *Antioch*, (and the *Romans* make a fourth of the ſame title)

title) and the *Nestorians* have their Patriarch at *Muzal*.

Of the many Heresies or Sects that rose up from the intemperate opposition to *Nestorius*, and the woful ruines they made in the East after the *Calcedon* Councils, and all caused by Pride and Prosperity, and wantonness of Wit, and stopt only by the Conquest of the *Sarazens* and *Arabians*, and how orthodox now in their Captivity and Poverty they all are, even the *Jacobites*, the *Nestorians*, the *Armenians*, the *Cophti*, the *Abassines*, the *Indians*, and the *Maronites*, see the notable words of *Brierwrod* Enquir. p. 180, 181, 182, 183. As also how the *Persian* King was a great cause of the spreading of the *Nestorians* through his Dominions.

LXVIII. The East and West were divided in *Justin*'s Reign, on the Question, whether the names of two Orthodox dead Bishops should be restored into the *Dypticks*, even *Euphemius* and *Macedonius*, whom the Pope had damned as communicating with Hereticks; the Bishops of the East being for it, and the West against it.

LXIX. *Justin* turning the stream for the *Calced.* Council, the Bishops in a Council at *Jerusalem*, and another at *Tyre* are for it, and condemn *Severus*. And a *Roman* Council condemneth the three dead Bishops of *C. P. Acacius*, *Euphemius* and *Macedonius*.

LXX. So far were the Bishops yet from Peace, that *Justinian* being Emperour, headed the Council Party, and his Wife the adverse Party.

About 30000 they say were then killed in *C. P.* at an Insurrection.

LXXI. A mischievous Schism for the Bishoprick at *Rome*, between *Boniface* 2. and *Dioscorus* and *Agapetus* after *Boniface*.

LXXII. In *Justinian*'s time a Controversie arose, whether we may say [*One of the Trinity was crucified?*] *Hormisda* Bishop of *Rome* said *No*. The *Nestorians* took hold of this and said, [*Then we may not say* Mary *was Mother to one of the Trinity.*] *Justinian* sent for a Council about it to Pope *John*: He and his Bishops concluded contrary to *Hormisda*, that we may say [*One of the Trinity was crucified.*] And say *Baronius* and *Binius* [*Ita mutatis hostibus arma mutari necesse fuit.*] Faith changeth as occasions change. Reader, if thou seest not here how Bishops have broken the Church in pieces, I must not tell thee, lest Mr. *M.* be angry.

I in-

I intreat the Reader to ſee what I ſaid, Hiſt. p. 132. of the Conference of *Hypatius* and the *Eutychians*.

LXXIII. A Council at *C. P.* calls their Biſhop *Patriarcha Oecumenicus*, and condemn divers Biſhops, as doth a Council at *Jeruſalem*.

LXXIV. At *Rome* the *Arian* King made *Silverius* Biſhop; and others choſe *Vigilius* that murdered him. *Vigilius* excommunicated *Menna* of *C. P.* which *Juſtinian* revenged.

LXXV. A new Controverſie is ſtated whether Chriſts body was corruptible: The denyers had *Gainas* A. Biſhop; The affirmers had *Theodoſius*; The firſt were called *Phantaſiaſtæ*, the other *Corrupticolæ*. Moſt were for *Gainas*, but the Soldiers for *Theodoſius*: They fought many daies, and the Soldiers killed many, and many of them were killed, and the Women with ſtones from the top of the houſes, and the Soldiers with fire, continued the war: And the diviſion continued in *Liberatus*'s daies: *Juſtinian* was ſo zealous for the Council of *Calcedon*, that he murdered thouſands (as they ſay) in *Egypt*, and yet dyed a reputed Heretick himſelf, being for the *Corrupticola*, and *Evagrius* ſaith, when he had ſet the whole world in tumult, he was damned himſelf. But God beſt knoweth that.

LXXVI. A Council at *Barcelona* Decree that Prieſts muſt cut their beards, but not ſhave them.

LXXVII. By the Cheat of an *Eutychian* Biſhop *Juſtinian* was perſuaded that the condemning of ſome Writings of *Theodore Mopſueſt*, *Theodorite* and *Ibas*, would reconcile the Biſhops: He calls a General Council at *C. P.* to that end (uſually called the 5th) His Letters are read opening the doleful diviſions, that the Churches had no Communion with one another, &c. The three Biſhops writings are read: *Theodorite* charged by this General Council with that ſalt Epiſtle againſt dead *Cyril*, and a like Speech at *Antioch*, and none vindicated him: *Binius* and Mr. *Morice* and others ſay the Letter is forged: I know not; But the *Tria Capitula* are condemned. And now this General Council hath made a new dividing ſnare. Many that were for the *Calcedon* Council feared this was a condemning of what they did in receiving *Theodorite*, &c. The Adverſaries were never the more ſatisfyed; but ſaith *Binius* himſelf [*The end was not obtained, but a moſt grievous miſchief added to the Church--- The whole Catholick Church was torn by Schiſm, and worſe, the Emperour ſtir'd up Perſecution,*

ſecution, depoſed or baniſhed P. Vigilius: *But leſt the Eaſt ſhould all forſake the Weſt, he recanted and conſented to the Council.* Doth either the work, or the effect commend this General Council?

LXXVIII. A Council of *Jeruſalem* ſave one Biſhop, preſently received this Decree.

LXXIX. A Weſtern Council at *Aquileia* condemn this 5th General Council at *C. P.* and (ſaith *Binius*) *ſeparated from the whole Catholick Church* (even from *Rome*) *for an hundred years till* Sergius *reconciled them.* Q. Were the Weſtern Biſhops or the Pope then the Weſtern Church? So many ſeparated, that *Vigilius* being dead, there could but two Biſhops (and a Presbyter) be got to ordain *Pelagius* his Succeſſor. But the Emperour and his Pope perſecute the Biſhops, and the Schiſm ſeemed deſperate.

LXXX. Another Council at *C. P. An.* 587. decree that *John* Biſhop of *C. P.* be called *The Univerſal Biſhop*; which greatly increaſed the Churches diviſions.

LXXXI. King *Gunthram* called a Council at *Maſcon An.* 589. finding all things grow worſe and worſe, & all long of the Biſhops only, ſaith *Binius.*

LXXXII. Even Great *Gregory* called a Synod againſt the diſſenting Biſhops, and they not obeying his ſummons, the Biſhop of *Aquileia* was ruined (the Weſtern Head) *Sabinian* that ſucceeded *Gregory* would have had his Books burnt. *Boniface* the third got *Phocas* the Murderer to declare *Rome* the Chief Biſhops Seat (He to whom *Greg.* had ſung *Lætentur cœli, & exultet terra,* &c.)

LXXXIII. Next roſe up the *Monothelite* Controverſie. *Cyrus* Biſhop of *Alexand.* to end the Controverſies aforementioned, was told that to uſe the word [*Dei virilis operatio & voluntas*] would unite them all, which paſt as *ſatisfaction* in a Council at *Alexand. P. Honorius* perſuaded them to ſilence [*One*] and [*Two.*]

But this Counſel was rejected, and now *whether Chriſt had* [*One* or *Two Wills and Operations*, became as *de fide*, the new War of the Biſhops through the world. Some were for [*One*] and ſome for [*Two*] as if [*Will* and *Operation*, and *One* or *Two*] were words that had but one ſignification; When every Novice in Philoſophy muſt grant that Chriſt's *Will* and *Operation* in ſome ſenſe, was but *One*, and in other ſenſes *Two*, as I have proved. But *Sergius* Biſhop of *Conſt.* ſet it on foot, *Heraclius* being for it, and *Pyrrhus* his Succeſſor followed it on. And *Sergius* by a Council

Council of Biſhops at *C. P.* decreed for [*One Will*]

The Opinion and the Emperour *Conſtans* his ſilencing both, are condemned at *Rome*. The Pope, Emperours and Biſhops, are all condemned, and perſecuting each other about it.

LXXXIV. *Conſt. Pogonat.* called a General Council at *C. P.* called the 6th, which condemned *Macarius* Biſhop of *Ant.* and the pacificatory Epiſtles of *P. Honorius* and *Sergius* as Heretical, and all that were for *One Will*, and *One Operation* of Chriſt; 1. As denominated *a naturis & earum principiis ſeu facultatibus*, *the Divine and Humane Will and Operations* were and are *Two*: 2. As *denominated ab unitate perſonæ*; they are the *Will* and *Operations* of *One perſon*, and ſo far may be called *One*. 3. As *denominated ab unitate objectivâ* they are *One*: The *Divine* and *Humane Nature will* the ſame thing, ſo far as the Humane *willeth*, and do ſo far the ſame work: But if any will make a new Hereſie by diſputing whether the Divine Nature alone do not *will* and *act* ſomewhat without the *volition* and *action* of the Humane (ſince the Incarnation) they ſhall have no company of mine in it. 4. In the ſenſe as the Operation of the principal and inſtrumental Cauſe are *One*, producing *One Effect*; ſo Chriſt's Divine and Humane Operations are *One*. 5. As *Conſent* denominateth *Unity*, and the Old Chriſtians are ſaid to be of *One heart and ſoul*, *One mind and mouth*; and Chriſt prayeth that we may be *One* in him, ſo his *Will* and *Operation* are *One*. 6. Yea if there be a ſort of *Union* between Chriſt & his Members, and between the Bleſſed in Heaven, which is quite beyond our preſent comprehenſion, it is much much more ſo between Chriſt's *Divine* and *Humane Will* and *Operations*.

And now Reader, whether it was well done to paſs over theſe and many other needful diſtinctions, and to put men barely to ſay that Chriſt's *Will* and *Operations* were not *One*, *but Two*, when really they were both *One* and *Two*; and to make the Pope himſelf a Heretick, for one of the wiſeſt Epiſtles that ever Pope wrote (I am no ſuch enemy to a Pope as to be partial;) and to divide the very Weſtern Church from *Rome*, and make *Aquileia* its Head for an hundred years, and to ſet all the *Roman* Empire in a flame, anathematizing and ſeparating from one another, becauſe they had not skill or ſobriety enough to ask each other by ſuch diſtinctions what they meant, I ſay, if this be wiſely and well done, and be a praiſe to Prelacy, and I be to blame for

blaming it, then good and evil is but what every diſeaſed ſoul will make it. Mr. *Morrice* and his Maſters, that honour their *Leviathan* for ſuch works as theſe, do tell us, that they would do it themſelves were it to be done again. And let it be their work, and the reward be theirs: For my part I abhor and renounce it.

LXXXV. Faith and Salvation now depended ſo much on Arithmetick, that the Biſhops of *Spain* raiſed another Arithmetical Controverſie, aſſerting *Three Subſtances in Chriſt, his Divinity, his Soul, and his Body*, and ſay, [*A Will begat a Will*, that is, the *Divine*, the *Humane*.] Theſe things are true. But the wiſe Pope was ſo affrighted with *Arithmetical Controverſies* by experience of the miſchievous Effects, that he cautioned them much about it, and for that ſome judged him erroneous.

LXXXVI. The Council at *Trull* was one of the beſt that ever they had, yet ſhewed the Core of the Churches Plague, by decreeing, *That whatever alteration the Imperial Power maketh on any City, the Eccleſiaſtical Order ſhall follow it.* This Clergy ambition nurſt up Anti-Chriſt.

LXXXVII. A Council at *Aquileia* condemned the 5th General Council for condemning the *Tria capitula.*

LXXXVIII. Pope *Sergius* condemning the *Trullane* Council, the Emperour commanded him to be a Priſoner, and the *Souldiers* bribed reſcued him.

LXXXIX. *Bardanes Philippicus* being made Emperor, he calleth a General Council at *C. P.* where, ſaith *Binius*, *out of the Eaſt there were innumerable Biſhops*, (which is not ſaid of any other Council) who all condemned the 6th General Council, and their Decrees of *Two Wills and Operations.*

Here (not I, but) *Baronius* and *Binius* ſay [*Thus at the Beck of an Emperour, and the Will of a Monothelite Patriarch, the holy 6th Synod is condemned, and what they ſaid of Two Wills with Chriſt, and two Operations, and all retracted by the Decree and Subſcription of very many Oriental Biſhops, that were in one moment turned from being Catholick to be Monothelites.*] But do they forget the 100 Year, that even the Weſt made a head againſt the 5th Council and the Pope.

XC. Next all the World is ſet together by the Ears about Images, for which the Pope rebelled againſt and rejected the Emperour for *Charles Martel* of *France.*

And Pope *Zachary* bid *Boniface* call a Council to eject the Aſſors of *Antipodes.*

XCI. In

CXI. In a General Council at *C. P.* 338 Biſhops condemned the worſhipping of Images, and ſwear men not to adore them, and deſtroyed reliques, *&c.* and decreed, that Chriſt's Body is not fleſh in Heaven: But the Pope and Weſtern Biſhops of his Party, condemn this Council.

XCII. The *Greek* Biſhops condemn the *Roman* Biſhops for adding [*Filioq;*] to the Creed, and ſo another occaſion of Schiſm is raiſed.

XCIII. The Schiſms in *Italy* and *Rome* itſelf now grew ſo great and the Effects in Blood and Confuſions ſo diſmal, that I muſt not number them one by one.

XCIV. *Conſtantine* and *Leo Iſaur.* Emperours, being dead, a Woman *Irene*, and her Infant Son are for Images, and call a General Council for them at *Nice*, where *Tharaſius* Biſhop of *C. P.* got the Biſhops to carry it for Images and Reliques, and the Chief Biſhops that had condemned them before, now cryed *peccavimus*, and condemned thoſe that were againſt adoration of Images, *&c.* If Mr. *Morrice* call me an Enemy to Repentance for reciting this, I cannot help it.

XCV. Yet more Schiſm: Two Biſhops, *Fælix* and *Elipandus*, ſay, *That Chriſt as the eternal Word was Gods natural Son, but as Man he was but his adopted Son*: (thinking that *duo fundamenta*, viz. *Generatio æterna, & temporalis, duas faciunt Relationes, filiationis in una perſona.*] But Councils condemned them as making two Sons. And the great Council at *Frankford* condemning the ſecond Council of *Nice*, and Image-worſhip, condemn alſo theſe two Biſhops, 1. For ſaying *Chriſt was God's Adopted Son*; 2. And that *by Grace*; 3. And that he was a *Servant*. Is any of this falſe, not excluding a higher title?

The Council concludeth that *Chriſt was not a Servant ſubjected to God by penal ſervitude*: Sure it was part of his ſuffering for our ſins, to be in the form of a Servant, *Phil.* 2. 7.

XCVI. *Binius* ſaith the *Filioq;* was added to the Creed by the *Spaniſh* and *French* Biſhops without the Pope.

XCVII. One Council at *C. P.* reſtored him that married the Emperour adulterouſly to another wife: And another condemned *Theod. Studita* and *Plato*, for being againſt it.

XCVIII. The moſt excellent Emperour *Ludov. Pius* was ſo zealous to reform the Biſhops, that they hated him, and in a Council at *Compendium* (*Compeigne*) moſt perfidiouſly depoſed him.

him, and after basely abused him, even without the Pope.

XCIX. As to please his *Son Lotharius*, they deposed the Father; so when he was beaten by his Brethren, they after in a Council at *Aquisgrane* (*Aken*) deposed *Lotharius*, accusing him as they did his Father.

C. At *C. P.* a Council was called by the power of another Woman *Theodora* and the Bishops that had under divers Emperours condemned Image-worship, now turn to it again, and anathematize on a sudden the opposers.

CI. The Bishops own *Lotharius* Adulterous marriage with *Waldrada*.

CII. The Councils that set up and pull'd down *Ignatius* and *Photius* at *C. P.* and the woful stir that they made as Emperours changed, were lamentable.

CIII. Many contrary Councils were between the *French* Bishops that were for *Lotharius* divorce and the Pope.

CIV. *Basil* the Emperour writes to the Pope to pardon all his Bishops, or else they should be without, because all had miscarried, and turned with the times.

CV. A General Council at *Const.* called by the Papists, *The Eighth General Council*, condemned *Photius* again, and set up *Ignatius*, and the Changers cryed, *peccavimus*, and make extreme Decrees for Images (But they well condemn *subscribing to be true to their Patriarchs and Bishops*;) but decree that all Princes and Subjects worship the Bishops, who must not fall down to them. Other horrid Elevations of Prelates above Princes they decreed---saying, *A Bishop, though it be manifest that he is destitute of all Virtue of Religion, yet is a Pastor*; and the Sheep must not *resist* the *Shepherd*.

CVI. A dangerous Rent between *Rome* and *C. P.* what Bishop should have the *Bulgarians*.

CVII. A Council at *Metz* called *Prædatorium*, gave the Kingdom to *Car. Calv.* unjustly.

CVIII. A Council at *Pavia* falsly make *Charles* Emperour.

CIX. Another (*Pontigonense*) confirmed it; (the Pope claiming the Power.)

CX. A *Roman* Council unjustly made *Ludov.* 3. Emperour.

CXI. A General Council at *C. P.* again set up *Photius*, and cast out [*Filioq;*.]

CXII. The *Roman* actions for and against *P. Formosus*, are odious to all sober Christians Ears.

CXIII. A

CXIII. A Council at *Soyſons* confirm the A. Biſhoprick of *Rhemes* to a Child of five years old, Son to the E. of *Aquitane*. Divers other Councils do and undo about the ſame Cauſe.

CXIV. The Hiſtory of the Biſhops of *Rome* and their Councils from hence forward is ſo lamentable that even the moſt flattering Papiſt Hiſtorians mention them with deteſtation. So that I muſt not ſtay to name many particulars.

CXV. *An.* 1049. A *Roman* Council was fain to pardon Simoniacal Biſhops and Prieſts, becauſe the Cry was, that elſe none would be left to officiate.

CXVI. Being come into the *Roman* ſink, I will paſs above an hundred more of the Councils of this woful ſort of Biſhops, leſt Mr. *Morrice* think that I ſuppoſe him to vindicate them, or not to abhor them. Only remembering my Reader of a few General or notable things: *viz.*

I. The multitude of Schiſms, and long vacancies at *Rome*; and the horrid incapacity of very many Popes, which prove an interrupted ſucceſſion.

II. The horrid wars that long infeſted *Italy* by the Popes means.

III. The diſmal wars with many Emperours, and the Biſhops and Councils half on one ſide and half on the other.

IV. The Council that called the Emperours and others Princes power of inveſting Biſhops, the *Henrician* Hereſie, and judg'd the Biſhops that had been for it to be dig'd out of their graves and burnt.

V. The Subjecting and debaſing of all Chriſtian Princes, making them but as the Body, and the Moon, and the Biſhops, to be as the ſoul and the ſun. Eſpecially the General *Lateran* Council which decreed Tranſubſtantiation, and all to be Hereticks that denied it; And oblige all temporal Lords to exterminate all ſuch Hereticks on pain of Excommunication, depoſition & damnation.

VI. The Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſils* that were for Reformation how falſly and cruelly they dealt with *Hus* and *Jerome* and rejected the four great requeſts of the *Bohemians*, and fixed their pollutions.

VII. The Councils of *Florence*, and that of *Trent*, which had more Learned men, who yet more obſtinately managed the Enmity to Reformation.

VIII. The preſent State of the Univerſal Church throughout the World as it is divided into *Papiſts*, *Proteſtants*, *Greeks*, *Moſcovites*,

covites, *Georgians*, with the *Circaſſians* and *Mengrelians*, *Armenians*, *Neſtorians*, *Jacobites*, *Cophtis*, *Abaſines*, *Maronites*, *Melchites*: And what thoughts theſe have of one another.

And I would deſire Mr. *Morrice* to tell us,

1. Whether he believes not verily that all theſe Inſtances prove that the Biſhops have been the chief cauſe, and that by Ambition, Pride and Worldlineſs?

2. Whether it be not the Biſhops that in the *Roman* and other Parties now, are the greateſt hinderers of Reformation, and of Concord? and it would not be ſoon done were it not through them?

3. Where it is that he will ſtop in his Vindication of the Biſhops and their Councils, and go no further? and by what cogent reaſon?

4. Whether he thought he had well defended the Church-Tyranny which I accuſed? 1. By vindicating the firſt Ages, and others whom I praiſed, and accuſed not; 2. And by letting fall his Vindication (ſave a few conſequent quibbles) at the fourth General Council; which was in 451. And ſo ſeems to vindicate the Biſhops and Councils but for the ſpace of 150 years of the time that I mentioned their degeneration?

5. Whether if the Biſhops had been willing when they had the King's Commiſſion to make neceſſary alteration, or were but to this day willing to prefer things neceſſary before things hurtful or indifferent, we might not live in happy and holy Love and Peace in *England*?

6. Whether he can blame a man that believes in Chriſt, for lamenting the doleful corruption and diviſion of the Chriſtian world, and for enquiring of, and lamenting the ſinful cauſes.

7. If that Church Prelacy which they juſtly call the beſt in all the world can endure no more Pariſh Diſcipline than we have, nor can endure ſuch a Miniſtry as are ſilenced by hundreds or thouſands (than whom no Nation on Earth abroad that I can hear of hath better) can you blame us for ſuſpecting that ſomewhat is amiſs with them, and more with others?

8. I hope you will yet remember that I did not appear as an accuſer of Prelacy or Conformity, but as importuned by your ſelves to give the reaſons why I dare not take your *Covenant* and *Oath* never to endeavour any alteration of your Church Government: and that after ſeventeen years ſilence. My prayers

to

to God ſhall be my endeavour for theſe following Alterations.

1. That the Primitive Diſcipline may be exerciſed in the Pariſh Churches, as *Bucer* importuned the King and Biſhops *de Regno Dei*, &c.

2. That to that end we may either have ſo many Biſhops under the Dioceſan as be capable to do it, or the Presbyters enabled, allowed and obliged to do it.

3. And that we may not inſtead of it have only a diſtant Court of men that know not the Pariſhioners, where a Lay Chancellour decreeth Excommunication, and Abſolution, which the Pariſh Prieſt muſt publiſh, though his conſcience be againſt it.

4. And that Dioceſans may not ſilence faithful Miniſters without ſuch cauſe as Chriſt will allow, nor ſet up ignorant bad ones and bind the Pariſhioners to hear and communicate with no other. I am ſo far from preciſe expectations from Dioceſans, or from reviling them, that I do conſtantly praiſe them as very good Biſhops who do no harm, or but a little, and if they ſhould never preach themſelves, ſo they will not hinder others.

9. And as for my calling *Things* and *Perſons* as they are, I hope you will not ſay that it was out of *Malice* that *Anaſtaſius Platina*, *Maſſonius*, *Stella*, *Sigibert*, *Baronius*, *Genebrard*, *Binnius*, &c. have recorded ſuch horrid crimes of Popes, and others alſo of Prelates. And is it malice in me to tranſcribe their Hiſtory?

I am of Dr. *Henry Moore*'s mind, who ſaith, [*Myſtery of Iniq.* p. 388. "*Hence it is plain that they are the trueſt friends to* "*Chriſtendom, even to* Rome *it ſelf, that do not ſooth them up in* "*their ſins, by mitigating and hiding their foul miſcarriages, but* "*deal apertly and plainly with them for their own ſafety; that nei-* "*ther admit, nor invent ſubterfuges to countenance or palliate their* "*Idolatrous and ſuperſtitious practices, but tell them plainly how* "*much they are apoſtatized from the true Worſhip of God and Chriſt* "*into Paganiſm and Idolatry. Better are the rebukes of a faithful* "*friend, than the hired flatteries of a glozing mercenary.*] I pray mark this well.

10. I take two things to be the degenerating and corruption of Epiſcopacy.

1. When they became ſo *bad* that they were not *willing* to do good according to their undertaken Office. Bad men will do ill in any place.

2. When they had put themſelves into a ſtate of *incapacity*, that they *could not do the Good* undertaken, were they never ſo willing.

1. Since great Baits of Wealth and *Domination* have tempted the worſt men to be the Seekers, Biſhops have rarely been good, except under a Saint-like Prince or People that had the Choice; nor are ever like to be. And what work the Enemies of Holineſs will make by abuſing Chriſt's Name againſt himſelf, is eaſie to know; ſuch will take the beſt men for the worſt, and call them all that's naught, that they may quiet their Conſciences in deſtroying them.

2. And ſince a Dioceſs of many hundred or ſcore Pariſhes hath had but one Biſhop for Diſcipline, the work is become impoſſible to the beſt. But when a few Bad men will mercinarily undertake Impoſſibilities, and ſo *Badneſs* and *Impoſſibility* go together, alas, what hope, but of a better world above?

Saith *Luther de Concil. & Eccleſ. p.* 300. *Sed quam ſunt intenti hanc craſſam & aſininam fatuitatem? Unus Epiſcopus nonnunquam habet tres Epiſcopatus vel Dioceſes, & tamen vocatur Unius Uxoris maritus, & cum habet tantum unum Epiſcopatum, tamen interdum habet centum, ducentas, quingentas Parochias, aut etiam plures, & vocatur tamen Sponſus unius Eccleſiæ--Hi non ſunt digami--Tam inſulſas & ineptiſſimas nanias recipit mens humana; ita permittente Deo cum a verbo diſcedimus, & omnia limatius & ſubtilius ſcrutamur quam ipſe vult nos ſcrutari.*] Whether you reverence *Luther* any more than *Calvin* I know not.

11. To conclude this matter, two things I deſire you, or at leaſt the Reader to conſider,

1. Whether it be not a dreadful thing for a man to make the Church corrupting, dividing and confounding ſins, to be all his own by defending or excuſing them, on a falſe pretence of Vindicating the Primitive Church Government, which was contrary to them?

2. Whether you truſt to Truth and Evidence, or to Intereſt and depraved Judgments, if you think men ſhall believe that you have confuted all this undoubted Hiſtory, and the preſent experience of all the woful Chriſtian World, by a general Cry that I write falſly and maliciouſly, or by ſaying that I am unlearned, or that I truſted to a Tranſlation, or *Binnius*, or that *Binnius* miſtook the year, (things that I will not turn over my Books

Books to try,) or that I misplaced or misunderstood a word of *Theodorite*, or mistranslated *Calami*, or such like. Such Believers of you are guilty of their own deceit.

§ 22. There is lately published by a nameless Prelatist, to shew the World what Spirit he is of, a Book pretending by the description of my Life from 1640. till 1681. to prove me one of the worst men alive. To that I will now say but these few words.

1. That let them take me to be as bad as they will, so they would have some mercy on their own and others Souls, and the Church of God.

2. That it's no wonder that we differ about Antient Times and History, and present Impositions, when the main difference in our Times is, who are godly, yea tolerable Christians, and who are intollerable Rogues; and those that (as before God) by long and intimate acquaintance, I judge to be the most serious, conscionable, humble, holy Ministers and People that were ever known to me, are the Persons that the Prelatists prosecute, silence, and cry out against as the most intollerable wicked Enemies of Piety, Truth and Peace. What is it that is the root of this?

3. That this foresaid Book is one continued Calumny, unworthy of an Answer, partly making my duty my sin (as that I disliked the many drunken Readers that were the Teachers of my Youth, *&c.*) and partly perverting scraps of sentences; and partly reciting one revoked *Book*, and a few retracted sentences of another, when *Augustin* is commended for retracting far more, and filling it with a multitude of most gross untruths, of his own fiction.

4. That as to his and Mr. *Morrice* and others talk of the Wars I say.

1. That I never thought the Parliament blameless.

2. That yet on *Bilson*'s grounds I was in my Judgment, and Speech, and Action, comparatively for them while they made their Commissions to *Essex* for King and Parliament.

3. That from *Naseby* Fight I wholly laboured to have drawn off their Souldiers from Errour, and Rebellion, and Usurpation; in which I did and suffered more than multitudes of my Accusers.

4. That I never went so far against the Power of the King as

R. Hooker whom I have long ago confuted.

5. That I never ſtruck or hurt man in the wars.

6. That I will conſent to be ſilenced and impriſoned if they will but give thoſe Miniſters leave to preach Chriſts Goſpel that never had to do with wars (unleſs for the King.)

7. That when our beginning Concord had reſtored the King, the *Scots*, though unſucceſsfully fought for him, *Monk* & his Army, that had bloodily (at *Dundee*, &c.) fought againſt him, had with the Concurrence of Sir *Tho. Allen*, the *Londoners* and Presbyterians reſtored him, when the King by them came in Triumph, Honoured *Monk* and others of them, confeſt them the Cauſe of his Reſtoration, paſt an Act of Oblivion that we might all live in future Peace, I ſay, If after all this it be Prelacy and Clergy Intereſt and Spirit, that will rub over all the healed wounds, and ſtrive again what ever it coſt us to ulcerate the peoples minds, and reſolve that the Land and Church ſhall have no Peace, but by the deſtruction of ſuch as reſtored the King; I ſhall think never the better of Prelacy for this. But ask them, why did you not Speak it out in 1660 to *Monk* and his Army, or till now.

§ 23. And whereas that Advocate (deſcribed *Joh.* 8.) and you are ſtill deceiving the ignorant by facing men down with Confidence that I lie in ſaying that [*Two Epiſcopal Parties began the War in* England *and the Papiſts and Preſbyterians came in but as Auxiliaries.*] I again ſay,

1. Allow me but reaſonable leave, and I will prove it to the ſhame of you if you deny it.

2. At preſent I will but recite one clauſe in *Whitlocks* Memorials, pag. 45. even after they thought themſelves under a neceſſity to pleaſe the *Scots* as far as they could. ["*Anno* 1640. "*The Commons had debate about a new Form of Eccleſiaſtical Go-*"*vernment*, and *July* 17. *agreed, That every Shire ſhall be a ſeve-*"*ral Dioceſs; a Presbytery of Twelve Divines in each Shire, and* "*a Preſident as a Biſhop over them; and he with the aſſiſtance of* "*ſome of the Presbytery to ordain, ſuſpend, deprive, degrade and* "*excommunicate. To have a Dioceſan Synod once a year, and* "*every third year a National Synod, and they to make Canons, but* "*none to be binding till confirmed by Parliament.*

"*The Primate of* Armagh *offered an expedient for conjunction* "*in point of Diſcipline, that Epiſcopal and Presbyterian Govern-*"*ment might not be at a far diſtance, but reducing Epiſcopacy to*

"*the*

" *the Form of Synodical Government in the Primitive Church*

Were not theſe men Epiſcopal? It's much like Mr. *Thorndike's* own motions ſaving his Opinion for Forein Juriſdiction.

§ 24. As to your firſt and laſt Chapters, and about the Antient Extent of Churches, while my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy, which fully confuteth you, is unanſwered; if I repeat it again, it will not be read by weary men. And another hath anſwered thoſe parts of your Book, which is ready for the Preſs.

I after tell you where *Chryſoſtom* even in his time numbers the Chriſtians in that great Imperial City to be an hundred thouſand, that is as many as in *Martins* and *Stepney* Pariſhes, and perhaps in *Giles Cripplegate* too.

§ 25. To conclude, whereas Mr. *M.* in general chargeth me as falſifying Hiſtory, I ſtill call my ſelf a HATER of FALSE HISTORY, and loath Mr. *Morrice's* Hiſtory, becauſe it is falſe: But if he will inſtead of falſifying and trifling, ſhew me any falſe Hiſtory that I have owned, I will thank him unfeignedly, and retract it. But factious reproaching of good men, and painting the deformed face of Vice, go not with me for convincing proof. If I am not near of kin to *Eraſmus*, I am a ſtranger to my ſelf, even as *Merula*, and M. *Adamus* deſcribe him, [*Ingenio erat ſimplex; adeo abhorrens a mendacio, ut puellus etiam odiſſet pueros mentientes; & ſenex ad illorum adſpectum etiam corpore commoveretur. Dignitatum & magnarum divitiarum contumax contemptor; neque quicquam prius otio habuit ac libertate.*] And I think, as it is ſaid of *Cuſpinian*, [*Ratus ſe ſatisfacturum ingenuo Lectori, ſiquæ veriſſima eſſe comperiſſet ſimpliciſſima oratione mandaret poſteritati: ſatis enim eſt hiſtorico* (*ut præclare dixit apud Ciceronem Catullus*) *non eſſe Mendacem.*]

And as to my ends and expectations, I am not ſo vain as to write with any great hope of perſuading many, if any who are poſſeſt of large Dioceſs, Wealth and Power, to forſake them, much leſs to cure the common Thirſt that corrupted Nature is poſſeſt with, and to be the means of a Publick Reformation: If I may ſatisfie my Conſcience, and ſave ſome from being deceived by falſe Hiſtory about the Cauſes of the Antient Schiſms, it's all that I can hope for: Had I lived in *Alb. Crantzius* daies, I might perhaps have ſaid as he of *Luther* [*Frater, Frater, abi in cellam tuam, & dic Miſerere mei Deus:*] *Et de Canonicis* κατ' ἐξοχὴν *dictis, Nunquam poſſe eos reduci ad meliorem frugem niſi*

niſi prius a viris doctis expugnata arce (i. e. Papatu.)

And for my ſelf, none of the Intereſted mens reproaches are unexpected to me: Anger will ſpeak. I know what the Papiſts ſay of the Reformers, and all the Proteſtants: And yet I expect that all at laſt will turn to the diſgrace of falſhood, by putting men to ſearch Church-Hiſtory for the Truth.

The caſe of *Capnio* is worth a brief recital. A covetous Jew pretending Converſion, contrived with the Fryers and Inquiſitors, to get a great deal of money from the Jews, by procuring an Edict from the Emperour to burn all the Jews Books, that ſo they might purchaſe them of the Fryers. The Emperour will firſt hear what *Capnio* a great Hebrician ſaith: *Capnio* adviſeth to ſpare all that only promoted the Hebrew Literature, and burn only thoſe that were written againſt Chriſt. *Hockſtrate* and the Fryers were vext thus to loſe the prey, and accuſed *Capnio* of Hereſie: The cauſe is oft tryed, eſpecially at *Rome*: All the Learned Hebricians were for *Capnio*: The Fryers raged the more: This awakened many Learned men to ſearch into the Cauſe, and armed them againſt the Fryers. *Galatinus*, *Hutten*, *Eraſmus*, &c. are for *Capnio*. The Fryers accuſe them alſo of Hereſie: But by this they ſtirred up ſuch a Party of the moſt Learned men againſt them, that when *Tezelius* came to vend his Indulgencies, *Luther* had ſo many ready to joyn againſt the Inquiſitors and Mercenary cheating Fryers, as greatly furthered the Reformation. And two or three ingenuous Conformiſts who have lately written againſt the violent battering Canoneers, do tell us that ſome are like to be excited by the Overdoing of the Accuſing ſilencing Party, to ſearch better into the matter of Fact and Right, till they can diſtinguiſh between an Eucraſie and a Tympanite.

Or if this world be incurable, they cannot keep us out of the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, where there is no Errour, Schiſm, nor Perſecution, becauſe no Ignorance, Malignity or Pride, but the General Aſſembly of perfect Spirits, are united in one perfect Head, in perfect Life, and Light, and Love.

The

The particular Defence of the Hiſtory of Councils and Schiſms.

An Account to Mr. Morrice *why my mentioning the Church-diſtracting ſins of the Clergy, when worldly grandeur corrupted them, is not a Diſhonouring, but a Honouring of the Primitive Church. And to vindicate thoſe ſins is no Vindicat ion of the Primitive Church.*

CHAP. I.

The Reaſon and Deſign of my Hiſtory of Biſhops and Councils.

§ 1. THEY that know the men with whom I have to do, and the Cauſe which I have in Controverſie with them, will eaſily underſtand my purpoſe. The Perſons with whom I am to deal, are ſuch as hold,

1. That a *General Council* of Biſhops or the Colledge of Biſhops Governing *per Literas formatas* out of Council, are the Supreme Governing Power over the Univerſal Church on Earth, having the Power of Univerſal Legiſlation and Judgment.

2. That among theſe the Pope is juſtly the Patriarch of the Weſt, and the *Principium unitatis* to the whole, and the ordinary Preſident in ſuch Councils. And ſay ſome, It belongs only to the Preſident to call them, and they are but rebellious Routs that aſſemble without a juſt call.

3. That there is no concord to be had but in the Obedience to this Univerſal Governing Church. But all Perſons and all National Churches are Schiſmaticks who live not in ſuch Subjection and obedience.

4. That ſuch as the Dioceſan Epiſcopacy which is over one loweſt Church containing hundreds or multitudes of Pariſhes and Altars without any other Biſhop but the ſaid Dioceſan is that Epiſcopacy which all muſt be ſubject to, while it is ſubject to the Univerſal ſupreme.

5. That every Chriſtian muſt hold ſubjective Communion with the Biſhop of the place where he liveth: And ſay ſome, muſt

must not practise contrary to his Commands, nor appeal for such practice to Scripture or to God.

6. That if this supreme Power silence the Diocesans, or these Diocesans silence all the Ministers in City or Country, they must Cease their Ministry and forsake the Flocks.

7. And say divers of them, They are no true Churches, or Ministers, that have not ordination from such Diocesans, yea by an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles: And for want of this the Forein reformed Churches are no true Churches, but the Church of *Rome* is.

Much more of this Nature I have already transcribed (and confuted) out of A. Bishop *Bromhall*, Dr. *Heylins* Life of A. Bishop *Laud*, Mr *Thorndike*, Mr *Dodwell* and divers others.

§ 2. The first thing then in my intention is to shew that the *Roman* Grandeur which is thought to be the Glory of the Church on Earth, and the necessary means of its Unity, safety and true prosperity, hath proved clean contrary, even the means of Church corruption in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline & Conversation, the Soil of the most odious crimes, the means of tyranny, suppression of true piety, and persecution of Gods faithful Servants, and of rebellious, War and cruel bloodshed.

§ 3. To this end I described the steps by which the Clergy ascended to the Papal height: For as all Protestants justly maintain that their Corruption of Doctrine & Worship came not in at once but by slow degrees, so do they also of the Papal Government and discipline. And they commonly shew the vanity of the Papists demand, who ask us who was the man, and which was the year, as if the world had gone to bed in simple Christianity, and awaked Papists the next morning. Whereas it is most evident in all Church history that the Clergy leaving the Christian Purity, Simplicity and Love, did climb the ladder step by step till they ascended to the Papal height. And it's a meer dream of them that think it was the Bp. of *Rome* alone that thus ascended, and not the Army that made him their General: As the boat riseth with the waters, so did the Pope with the ascending Clergy: Others strove for superiority as he strove for Supremacy: The strife began among Christs Apostles who should be greatest, and who should, sit next him in his Kingdom; And though Christ then suppresst it by his Word and Spirit, and the sufferings of the Church took down those aspiring thoughts, as soon as *Constantine* had set them the Ladder

Ladder, what ſcrambling was there who ſhould climb higheſt. Yea *Conſtantinople* ſtrove for the Supremacy it ſelf.

§ 3. And I the rather mentioned this becauſe I found ſome late learned Expoſitors of the Revelations, taking this inordinate aſcent, for the promiſed glory and felicity of the Church on Earth; and taking it for the fulfilling of many of thoſe prophecies and promiſes which ſome applyed to the Millennium, and ſome to the heavenly ſtate. And doubtleſs *Hildebrand* and his adherents had ſuch thoughts, and did believe that their rule over Emperours, Kings and Kingdoms, by the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, was the true Glory of the Church, and the Reign of Chriſt, and that all the honour was indeed given to Chriſt as King of the Church, which was thus given to the Pope and the Church-Parliaments of Biſhops. *Campanella de Regno Dei* doth but ſpeak the thoughts of greater Clergy men when he applyeth the foreſaid Texts to prove that the Popes Univerſal Monarchy is the true Kingdom of Chriſt on Earth, to which all Monarchs and Men muſt ſtoop.

And Nature is ſo apt to entertain ſuch thoughts, eſpecially in the Clergy, who think of it as their own proſperity and glory, that it is no wonder, if as *Venner*, and his Fifth Monarchy men, did itch to be getting up under the name of the Reign of Chriſt, and ſo did *John* of *Leyden* and his Company at *Munſter*; ſo the Fifth Monarchy Clergy men, who can aſpire more plauſibly, do long to be climbing, and are very reconcilable to Papal Greatneſs; and where Popery is become a diſtaſted name, they nevertheleſs deſire their ſhare in the Power, Honour and Wealth, and under pretence of Peace and Concord among all Chriſtians, and reſtoring the Church to its Unity and Strength, they ſtrive for much of the ſame thing, and think it enough to avoid the name: And the Pope ſhall be but *Principium Unitatis*, and the Preſident of the Clergy or Councils. Get but the poor trick of calling nothing Popery but the Pope's Arbitrary abſolute Power, and do but tie him to Rule by the Conſent and Laws of Church-Parliaments, that is, ſet up the *French* Church-Government, and then they are no Papiſts. Do not the *French* Proteſtants deſerve all their ſufferings then for calling the Church or Biſhops there *Papiſts*, and ſeparating from ſo Excellent a Government?

§ 5. And it was not the leaſt of my Motives to try, were it poſſible to cure their Love-killing Errour, who think that all

are Enemies to Unity and Peace, who are not for Obedience to this Universal or Superlative Prelacy, and to save us all from that confusion and calamity, which this Opinion is carrying on, while the Patrons of it think that all are to be prosecuted, silenced, ruined as Rebellious Enemies to the Ruling Church, who do not subject themselves to such a Prelacy; and that we must or can have no Christian Church-Concord, but by Obedience to the Universal Church, as Bishop *Gunning* hath over and over told me, that is, to the Universal Colledge of their sort of Bishops: Yea not only the Papists, but these Bishops among us, to this purpose repeat and apply *Psal.*72.11. Yea all Kings shall fall down before him: All Nations shall serve him. Or *Isa.* 60.12. *For the Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: Yea those Nations shall be utterly wasted,*] which Bishop *Gunning* applyeth to the Episcopal Universal-Governing Colledge.

These are terrible threatnings, as they shew the principles and purposes of men, however they mistake the mind of God. Few parts of *Europe* have had more long and cruel Wars, than *Italy* it self, where these Principles have obtained: But the blood of thousands of sincere Christians hath been a Sacrifice to these Principles in the Clergy. When we read in Jesuites, Fryers and Prelates, sound Christians called Hereticks, and all such Hereticks called, mortal, odious, wicked, pernicious, intollerable Enemies to the Church, whom all good men are bound to endeavour to root out and destroy; when we hear our neighbour Papists say, *It is no more sin to kill an Heretick than a Dog*: And when we hear and read our Clergy calling out to Magistrates for yet more *Execution upon us*, for not obeying them against that which we undoubtedly take for the Law of God; and the nearer any man is to the Papists, usually the more he is for our destruction, and for their way of cruelty, I thought it time to try if it were possible, if not to save the Land from this consuming fire, yet at least to save some Souls who else were like to be tempted to malignant Enmity to the best and truest Christians, and to perish for ever by this deceit.

How many honest passages are in Mr. *Thorndike* which shew that it was not any worldly interest of his own that moved him; but yet the Power of this Errour [*Of a Church that was Universally One by One Ruling Colledge or Council of Prelates, of which*

which the Pope was the rightful Preſident,&c.] which muſt be acknowledged by all Nations and Perſons, that will have Chriſtian Communion and not be condemned Schiſmaticks, prevailed with him to the exclusion of all Diſſenters, and confining his Communion to thoſe only who owned and obeyed *This Univerſal Governing Church*.

§ 6. And as long as this Opinion prevaileth, eſpecially in men of Power and Reverence who take other mens belief and obedience for their unqueſtionable right, where can we think hatred and Perſecution will ſtop. Will not they ſtill think that they that kill or ſilence or impriſon or baniſh us, do God ſervice, and that the Magiſtrate that doth not puniſh us deſerveth puniſhment from God, if not alſo from the Church. And they that are moſt for Seldom preaching, and can diſpenſe with our Miniſterial labour therein, will not be indifferent as to the ſilencing, impriſoning or deſtroying us.

§ 7. Whether we have any reaſon to refuſe ſwearing or ſubſcribing to them, and never to endeavour any alteration of their Government as it is in *England*, I have ſincerely endeavoured to ſhew in my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy. And if Chriſtian Concord and Communion be ſo hard and narrow a thing, as that no men are Capable of it who are not of a higher form than I, as to underſtanding, impartiality and willingneſs to know the Truth, the Church and Chriſtianity are things beyond my capacity and reach: But I doubt not but it is humane errour that would dwindle it into ſo ſmall a Sect.

§ 8. Alas what Perſons for Knowledge and Life can they bear with in their Communion, who cannot bear with ſuch as they ſilence and ruine in this Land! And the Papiſts can receive even thoſe that know not Chriſt if they do but profeſs obedience to the Clergy-Church. *Luthers* words are harſh, but I will recite them *de Conciliis Part* 3. *Pag* 291. *Si monſtraverint mihi unum aliquem ex tota illa multitudine qui poſſit æquare unum alphabetarium in aliqua erudita Schola, aut in ſumma doctrina Chriſtiana, vel in Scriptura Sacra tantum profecerint, quantum una aliqua puella ſeptem annorum; tunc illis concedam palam-- niſi quod plus callent traditionum humanarum, & Sycophantiarum: Quod valde credo, & firmius quam in Deum credo, cum me convincant facto ipſo ut credam.* To this paſs did the Clergies aſpiring then bring the Church, when worthy men were ſilenced and perſecuted.

ſecuted. And we are unwilling of any thing that looketh towards a differencing men ſo contrary to that which Chriſt will make at laſt.

CHAP. II.

Whether we have any reaſon to report the Faults of ſome Biſhops and Councils, from the beginning of their Depravation till the laſt?

§ 1. THat I had great reaſon for it, I think what is before ſaid will evince; when we ſee men deſtroying Chriſtian Love, themſelves, and us, and the Land, could they prevail, by their erroneous endeavour to grant no Concord, Communion nor Peace, to no Chriſtians how conſcionable otherwiſe ſoever, who cannot unite in a ſpecies of Prelacy which they believe (by ſuch evidence as I have given) to be contrary to the Law of Chriſt. To the ſaving men from Hereſie and Schiſm now, our oppoſers (and we) do judge it uſeful, to know how Hereticks and Dividers miſcarried heretofore, that others may beware. And is it not as true if Biſhops be the Dividers? And alſo when the Clergies Ambition and Uſurpation have brought that upon the Chriſtian World which it languiſheth and groaneth under in Eaſt and Weſt, is it not needful to open the beginning and progreſs of the diſeaſe, by ſuch as had rather it were cured, than the Church deſtroyed by it?

§ 2. Among the multitude of Proteſtant Church-Hiſtorians and Chronologers, how few are there that do not do the ſame, though in various degrees? He that will read the *Magdeburgenſes*, or *Lucas Oſiander*, *Illyrici Teſt. Verit.* *Melanchon* himſelf, and *Carion Funccius*, yea peaceable holy *Bucholtzer*, *Micrelius*, *Meander*, *Phil. Pareus*, *Hen. Gutberleth*, &c. yea or *Julius* or *Joſ. Scaliger*, *Salmaſius*, *Hottoman*, *Hottinger*, *Morney*, ſhall ſee the faults of Biſhops opened before this day.

§ 3. The pious and moderate Papiſts themſelves report and lament them: Such as *Clemangis*, *Pelagius Alvarus*, *Mirandula*, *Ferus*, *Joſ. Acoſta*, *Lud. Vives*, *Gerſon*, *Eraſmus*, and many other ſuch.

§ 4. The antient Godly Biſhops are they who for the moſt part

part have been freeſt in reprehending the vices of the reſt; eſpecially *Greg. Nazianzen*, and *Chryſoſtom*, and many antient godly Presbyters have been as free, as *Gildas*, *Iſidore Peluſiota*, *Salvian*, *Sulp. Severus*, *Bernard*.

§ 5. And if I have wronged the Biſhops or Popes in this Abridgment, their own Hiſtorians, yea their chief flatterers have wronged them. One Pope angered *Platina* by impriſoning him: Yet if he be partial, it is for the Clergy, and not againſt them. But who will believe that *Binnius*, *Baronius*, *Crab*, *Genebrard*, *Bellarmine*, *Petavius*, and ſuch others have ſpoken too hardly of them. There is no one man that I took ſo much from as *Binnius*: And what ſhould move him to name ſo many of the miſcarriages of the Councils, but the neceſſity of reciting the Acts of the Councils hiſtorically as he found them?

§ 6. The Sacred Scriptures record the Crimes of the beſt men in all the Ages of which they write, even *Adams*, *Noes*, *Lots*, *Aarons*, *Davids*, *Solomons*, *Hezekiahs*, *Joſiahs*, *Peters*, all the Apoſtles, *&c.* And it was not done out of ſpite or malice; but as a neceſſary warning to us all.

§ 7. The falſhood of Hiſtory is an intollerable abuſe of mankind: To know nothing done before our times, is to ſhut up mankind in a dungeon; and falſe Hiſtory is worſe than none. And it may be falſe and deceitful in *defect* as well as *exceſs*. He that ſhould record all that was good in the Popes, and omit all the reſt, would be a dangerous deceiver of the world, and do more than hath been done to make all Chriſtians Papiſts. You tell us your ſelves, that he that ſhould write the Hiſtory of *Cromwell*, *e. g.* or of any Sect that you are againſt, and ſhould leave out all their faults, would be taken for a falſe Hiſtorian.

§ 8. They that write the Hiſtory of mens Lives, do uſe to record their Parentage, Birth and Education: And ſo muſt he that will truly write the Hiſtory of Church-Tyranny, Perſecution and Schiſm. The end is not well underſtood without the beginning. Who is it that heareth how many Ages the Chriſtian world hath been divided into *Papiſts*, *Greeks*, *Jacobites*, *Neſtorians*, *Melchites*, &c. and that ſeeth what work the Papacy hath made, but will ask how all this came to paſs? Did the man that died of Gluttony, ſwallow all at one morſel? or rather one bit after another? And when the Clergy have ventured on one merry Cup, or one pleaſant morſel in exceſs, it's

eaſie

easie to make them believe that one, and one, and one Cup more; one, and one, and one bit more, is no more unlawful than the first. *Principiis obsta*, is the Rule of Safety.

If Papists intending the recovery of *England* to the Pope should say [" *Let us but first get them under the Oaths, Covenants* " *and Practices which we will call Conformity, and so cast out most* " *that dare not sin, and by this engage them as two Armies in con-* " *trary Interest to fight against each other, and it will be an easie* " *matter to bring the swallowing Party to go further by degrees, and* " *to believe that as a Parish Church must not be independent as to* " *the Diocesan, nor the Diocesan to the Metropolitical or National,* " *so neither must a National be independent as to the Universal:* " *And that the Universal therefore must have its known stated Go-* " *vernment as well as the National,*] Were it not necessary here for him that would save the Land from Popery to shew the danger of the first degrees.

The usual Method is not to use *Boccalines Roman* Engine, which will help a man to swallow a Pompion that he may get down a Pill, but to swallow a lesser Pill first and a bigger next, till the Pompion will go down. Infancy is before manhood.

§ 9. But the great necessity was as aforesaid, from the revived or rather Continued attempts, of imitating the fatal *ambitious* and *Contentious* malady. If Priscillians, or Gnosticks should rise now among us, were it not our duty to set before them the history of the miscarriage of their predecessours. And when men are so much set on restoring an Universal Supremacy, is it not meet to shew them where, and when, and with what success the aspiring humour did begin. If we have small visible probability of escaping, we must yet before we come to *Smithfield*, satisfy our Consciences that we betrayed not the Church.

CHAP. III.

Of Mr. M's notice that I am Unlearned.

§ 1. MR. *M*'s Preface Contracteth the Chief things which he hath to say against me in his book, that the Reader may find them there all together. And of these [*that I am unlearned*] is not the least. And if that be any of his question I assure him it shall be none of mine. I am not yet so vain as to

to plead for my Learning: Yea, I will gratify him (though he accuſe me of being againſt repentance) with an unfeigned confeſſion that my ignorance is far greater than his accuſation of *unlearnedneſs* doth import. Alas I want the knowledge of far more excellent things than languages. I do but imperfectly know my ſelf, my own ſoul, my own thoughts and underſtanding: I ſcarce well know what knowing is. Verily if no knowledge be properly true that is not adequate to the object I *know nothing*: And ſubſcribe to *Zanchez, quod nihil Scitur*, (by ſuch as I.) Alas Sir I groan in darkneſs from day to day, & I know not how to be delivered! How little do I know of that God whom the whole Creation preacheth, and of that Society which I hope to be joyned with for ever, and that world which muſt be my hope and portion, or I am undone. Many whom I am Conſtrained to diſſent from upbraid me with my ignorance, and I ſuppoſe it is that for which they ſilence me, reproach, hate and proſecute me; even becauſe I have not knowledge enough to diſcern that all their impoſitions are lawful (or elſe I know not what it is for) But none of them all can (and will) tell me, how I ſhould be delivered from this ignorance: If they ſay, [*It muſt be by hard ſtudy*] I can ſtudy no harder than I have done. If they ſay [*I muſt be willing to know the truth*] I take my ſelf for ſure that I am ſo: If in that alſo I am ignorant, in thinking that I know my own mind when I do not, what elſe then can I hope to know? If they ſay [*You muſt be impartial*] I think I am ſo, ſaving that I muſt not deny or caſt away the truths already received. If they ſay [*You ſhould read the ſame books which have convinced us*] I read far more of the Papiſts and *Prelatiſts and other ſects* that write againſt me, than of thoſe that are for me. And the more I read the more I am confirmed. And when theſe men preach and write againſt the *Calviniſts*, they render them odious as holding that *men are neceſſitated to ſin* and *to be damned*, and that it is long of *Gods Decree which cannot be reſiſted:* Therefore I ſuppoſe they will not lay the Cauſe on God. I do then confeſs my Ignorance, of matters a thouſandfold greater and more needful than thoſe which they mention in their accuſations. I confeſs my ſelf unlearned: But I intreat them that tell me of my diſeaſe (which I know to my daily grief much better than they) to tell me alſo how I may be cured. If they ſay that it muſt be by *Fines and Impriſonment* it hath been tryed & I am yet uncured: I hope they

will

will not pronounce me remedileſs and not tell me why, who uſe themſelves to ſpeak againſt thoſe that preach men into deſperation; would they but tell me the ſecret how ſo many thouſands of them came to be ſo much wiſer than I, in far ſhorter time, and with far leſs ſtudy, it would be (if true) an acceptable deed of Charity; rather than to tell me of the Ignorance which I cannot help. Could I but know needful truth in Engliſh, I would joyfully allow them to glory of being more skilful in all the Oriental Tongues, and alſo in *French, Iriſh, Spaniſh and Italian*, than I am.

CHAP. IV.

Of his Accuſation, that I vainly name Hiſtorians which I never ſaw or read.

§ 1. I Muſt profeſs that it never was my purpoſe to tell the world how many Hiſtorians I have read; nor to abridge all that I have read: And thoſe that I have moſt read I have there made no mention of, as not being for my intended end: And multitudes that ſtood by me, I never opened to the writing of this hiſtory, my deſign being chiefly againſt the Papiſts and thoſe Proteſtants who moſt eſteem their writings, and had rather unite with the French Papiſt Church, than with us Nonconformiſts: Therefore when I was paſt the firſt 400 or 500 years, it was the greateſt and moſt flattering Popiſh hiſtorians that I abriged, as *ad hominem* being likeſt not to be denyed.

I told the reader that I made not uſe of *Luther* the *Magdeburgenſes*, nor the Collections of *Goldaſtus, Marquardus Freherus, Reuberus, Piſtorius*, &c.] And the Printer having put a Comma between *Marquardus* and *Freherus*, he Conjectures that I took him for two men, becauſe I added not the *Chriſtian names of the reſt*: And he concludes that [*whoever this miſtake belongs to, it's plain that M. B. had but little acquaintance with theſe Collections.*] For I *name ſome of the Authors therein.*

Anſ. Seeing theſe things are thought juſt matter for our accuſers turn, I will crave the Readers patience with ſuch little things while I tell him the truth. It is about 25 years ſince I read the *German* Hiſtory in the Collections of *Freherus, Reuberus* and *Piſtorius*, and about 30 years ſince I read the Collections of

of *Goldaſtus*: The *Magdeburgenſes*, *Oſiander*, *Sleidan*, or any ſuch Proteſtants I thought vain to alledge to Papiſts. About ſeven or eight years ago as I remember, I was accuſed for Preaching, and Fined by Sir *Thomas Davis*; and the Warrant was ſent by him to Sir *Edm. Bury Godfrey* to levy it on me by Diſtreſs: I had no way to avoid it but *bona fide*, to make away all that I had: Among the reſt I made away my Library, only borrowing part of it for my uſe. I purpoſed to have given it almoſt all to *Cambridge* in *New-England*: But Mr. *Knowles* (yet living) who knew their Library, told me that Sir *Kenelme Digby* had already given them the Fathers, Councils and Schoolmen, but it was Hiſtory and Commentators which they wanted. Whereupon I ſent them ſome of my Commentators, and ſome Hiſtorians among which were *Freherus*, *Reuberus* and *Piſtorius* Collections, and *Nauclerus*, *Sabellicus*, *Thuanus*, *Joſ. Scaliger de Emendat. Temp.* &c; But *Goldaſtus* I kept by me (as borrowed) and many more which I could not ſpare; and the Fathers and Councils and Schoolmen I was ſtopt from ſending. Now whether I was unacquainted with thoſe that partly ſtand yet at my Elbow, and which I had read ſo long ago, muſt depend on the Credit of my *Memory*; and I confeſs my Memory is of late grown weak, but not ſo weak as to think that *Marquardus Freherus* was not one man, and a Palatinate Councillor, though it be names that I moſt forget; why I gave not the Chriſten names of *Reuberus* and *Piſtorius*, whether becauſe I forgat them, or becauſe I minded not ſo ſmall a thing, not dreaming what would be inferred from it, I remember not. But when I wrote that abridgment, I made uſe of none that I thought the Papiſts would except againſt: For the firſt ages I gathered what I remembred out of the Fathers, and out of *Euſebius*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Evagrius*, *Theodoret*, the *Tripartite*, *Nicephorus*, *Liberatus*, *Brev. Victor Vtic.* *Beda*, and ſuch others as are by them received: Beſides which I principally followed and Epitomized *Binnius*, and *Crab*, and partly *Baronius*, with *Platina*, *Onuphrius Panuinius*, *Stella*, *Petavius*, and others of their own. And I reſolved I would not ſo much as open *Goldaſtus*, or any Proteſtant Collector, that they might not except againſt their Credit, and reject them as *malicious curſed Hereticks*, as *Labbe* doth *Melchior Goldaſtus* and almoſt all ſuch others as he mentions; and as *Gretſer*, *Sanders*, and other Papiſts commonly do. Therefore even thoſe Hiſtories which

be in *Goldastus*, I would not take as out of him, but some of them from the books published by others, and some as cited by *Binnius*, *Petavius*, or other such. And this is now the proof of my Vanity.

§ 2. It is a mistake if he think that I intended (as he speaks) to be a *Compiler of General Church History*; When I professed but to acquaint the English Reader with the true matter of fact out of the Papists themselves, what the ambitious part of Bishops and Councils have done, and by what degrees the Papacy sprang up, and whether subjection to the ascendent exort Prelacy be absolutely necessary to Concord and Salvation.

§ 3. As to his saying [*I am the first that ever reckoned* Nazianzen *among Historians*,] I take the writings of the Fathers, especially *Justin*, *Clemens Alex.* *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Eusebius*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Hierom*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustin*, to be the best part of Church History, especially their Epistles. And of this opinion I am not the first.

CHAP. V.

Of his Accusation of my citing Hanmer *and other Translators, and being deceived by* Binnius *and such others.*

§ 1. 1. HE accuseth me for not using *Valesius* his Edition of *Eusebius* and those Editions of the Councils which he accounteth the best: To which I say,

1. I am not Rich Enough to buy them, nor can keep them if I had them. Must none write but Rich men? The French Councils would cost more than many of us are worth: We have had no Ecclesiastical maintenance these 19 years; and we cannot keep the books we have. *Luther* wrote his book *de Conciliis* when it seems he had never read many of the Councils Acts, but as related by *Eusebius Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and the *Tripartite* History.

2. Dr. *James* hath long ago warned all Scholars to make much of *Crab* and other old ones, (and the Fathers as Printed at *Basil* by *Erasmus*, *Amerbachius*, &c.) and not to trust much to new Editions, as coming through untrusty hands.

3. Is

3. Is *Valeſius* a man of ſo much credit with you? Do you believe what he ſaith of *Grotius* as being in judgment for the Papal Church, and only in prudence delaying his viſible Communion with them, that he might draw in many with him? (*Valeſ.* in *Orat. de Petavio*:) If he lye in this, and the ſucceſs of *Petavius* on *Grotius*, why ſhould he be more truſted than others? If not, I need not tell you what to think of thoſe Biſhops and Drs. who profeſs to be of the ſame mind and Church as *Grotius*; nor again to tell you who they be.

4. My deſign led me not to make uſe of Criticks, but only to tell the world, what the Papiſts themſelves confeſs, ſuch as I have throughout cited.

§ 2. As for my uſing *Hanmers* Tranſlation of *Euſebius* and *Socrates*, my caſe was as before deſcribed: *Valeſius* I had not: *Grineus* I made uſe of heretofore. But ſince I was by conſtraint deprived both of my books and money to buy more, when I wrote that Abridgment, I had only *Hanmers* Tranſlation left me. And if that ſort of men that forced me to give away my books, to keep them from being diſtreined on, will make uſe of this to prove me ignorant of them, the matter is very ſmall to me.

If you ſay, I ſhould not then have written, I anſwer, could they ſo have ſilenced us in the Pulpit, they had more anſwered their own judgment than mine. I had no uſe for Criticks, nor for any thing in *Euſebius* and *Socrates* that depends on the credit of the Tranſlator.

§ 3. As to his oft noting that in Tranſlations, and ſometime in Chronology I err by following *Binnius*, I anſwer, had I written a full Church Hiſtory, I ſhould better have examined him and others. But I lay no ſtreſs of my cauſe of any of *Binnius* his Tranſlations, nor will I undertake for any Hiſtorian that I cite: My buſineſs was but to tell thoſe that believe *Binnius* and *Baronius*, and ſuch other, what they ſay. Nor do I yet intend to beſtow any time, in examining whether he wrong *Binnius* or not, it being nothing to my cauſe nor me, whether he miſtook a year, or the meaning of a word of the Authors whom he citeth.

§ 4. He ſaith I uſe an old uncorrect Edition of *Binnius* 1606. *Anſ.* It is that which is in moſt common uſe, entituled, *Recognita, Aucta, notis Illuſtrata*, dedicated to the Pope, and to *C. Baronius, ejus monitu ſcripta, qui veterem illam, mendoſam, mutilam & confuſam compilationem mille locis illuſtravit*, &c. commonly

Preferred before *Crab*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, &c. But any quarrel ſerveth ſome men.

CHAP. VI.

Of his Accuſations of my own Miſtranſlations and Miſtakes.

§ 1. OF theſe there are two real Overſights which he nameth, committed by too much haſt and heedleſneſs: The one is, that I miſplaced [*Vere*] in the Tranſlation of a Speech of *Theodorets*; a groſs overſight I confeſs: The other, that I put [*Epiſcopi*] as if it had been the Genitive caſe, when it was the Nominative plural; which alſo was a heedleſs overſight. And about the death of *Stephanus*, he noteth my miſtranſlating *Calami*; and I imagine yet he is ſcarce certain what it ſignified himſelf. As for his note of my uſe of [*Scripture*] about the *Epheſine* Council, I purpoſely kept to the literal Tranſlation, that none might ſay I did miſtranſlate it; but I never ſaid that by the *Scriptures* was meant the Bible.

§ 2. This Accuſer puts too great an honour on ſuch a Hiſtory as mine, which goeth through ſo many Ages and Acts, in noting ſo few, and ſuch little things. I never pretended to be as good an Hiſtorian as he is; yet I do not think that it was any thing but a ſlip of memory that made him put *Euſtathius* inſtead of *Flavian*, as kickt to death at *Epheſus*. And methinks he that thus begins his *Errata* of his own Book [*The faults that have eſcaped are almoſt infinite*:] ſhould not for one falſe Comma of the Printers, have paſſed the foreſaid cenſure of me.

But doth not this Learned Hiſtorian know, how ordinarily the greateſt of them do charge one another with manifold Errours, and of far greater moment than theſe forementioned. How few Hiſtorians do not this? Yea what bitter cenſures doth he paſs himſelf on no lower Hiſtorians than *Socrates* and *Sozomen*? It would be tedious to give you the Inſtances that every ſuch Book affordeth. I ſee he valueth *Labbe* the Jeſuite. How oft doth he accuſe Hiſtorians of Errour, Ignorance, Malice, *&c. e. g. de Anaſtaſio Biblioth.* ſo eminent a Writer of the Popes Lives, yet [*Errat Voſſius & ſiqui alii cum Anaſtaſio Presbytero*, &c.] And

even

even of that famous History of the Popes. [*Onuphrius Panuinius, Gerh. Voſſius, & plerique alii ultimam conſent eſſe ab Anaſtaſio ſcriptam, Nicolai* I. *Papæ Vitam, & a Gulielmo S.R.E. Bibliothecario additas fuiſſe Hadr.* 2. *& Steph.* 6. P. *Vitas* : *Verum Cardinalis Baronius iis refragatur eidemque auctori omnes illas aſcribit ; ſunt quoque qui a Damaſo Papa, &c.*] Here the greateſt Hiſtorians differ about one of the moſt noted Hiſtories.

Of *Auguſtin's* Works (*To.* 1. *p.* 129.) he tells you that *Bellarmine* tells us not what Edition he uſed : But it's certain he uſed not the *Antwerp*, or *Plantinian* Edition, which was the beſt, and the Original of all the reſt.]

P. 132. *Rivet* and *Perkins* are derided for diſowning ſome Epiſtles.

P. 135. *Eraſmi, Riveti ſimiliumque ridetur a doctis cenſura* (*viz. de lib. Continent.*) And I profeſs my ſelf leſs skilful in ſuch matters than *Eraſmus*.

Et ibid. Eraſmus & Heſius Juliano opus illud tribuere videntur, Pamelius tanquam incerti Authoris allegat : Nos cum Lovanienſibus Bellarmino, aliiſque Catholicis Auguſtini eſſe cenſemus, nec tricæ Riveti deterrent.

P. 136. *Quæſt. Vet. & Novi Teſt. non ſunt Auguſtini ut facile omnes conſentiunt : Quamvis ſub ejus nomine citata reperiantur ab Epiſcopis Lutetiæ Pariſ. An.* 824. *Congregatis & quibuſdam aliis.*

Of *Auſonius* the Poet, *p.* 171. he ſaith, [*Quam falſa ſint quæ de eo ſcripſit Jo. Trithemius quivis vel ex ipſa lectione intelliget.*

Of *Mantuan*, *p.* 173. [*Ex Trithemii encomio hæc dubio procul omni obliteranda* : [*Qui metro Virgilium, Ciceronem proſa æquat, ne dicam ſuperat* :] *Sunt enim falſiſſima iis qui guſtum aliquem latinitatis habent.*

Of *Beda*, *p.* 184. See what he ſaith of *Will. Malmsbury*, *Mat. Weſtminſt. Voſſius* and *Baronius*.

Of *Boethius*, *p.* 204. *Honorius Auguſtod.---ubi falſo narrat Mediolani interfectum fuiſſe---*

P. 217. *Plura adverſus Leunclavium, primum eorum editorem declamavit Jac. Billius* (*de Cæſario.*)

De Claudio Scoto, p. 228. *Tho. Dempſterus multa pro more ſuo indigeſta effudit---*

De Gerſone, p. 565. *Errat poſt Poſſevinum Maraccius qui Joan. hunc Monachum ordinis cœleſti---aſſerit---Idem quoque ex Patrologo eradendum.*

See

See what he ſaith *de Julio Africano*, that the *Annotationes eruditiſſ. in Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt.---Opinioni noſtræ in pleriſque adverſantur.*] I ſuppoſe he means that *Valeſius* which I wanted.

And *de Juſtino Mart. Scaligerum erraſſe, &c.*] *Et p.* 833. (*inſigne mendum ex Trithemio, Geſnero, Simlero, Sexto, Poſſevino,* Bellarmino, Miræo, *aliiſque propagatum*---)

To. 2. *p.* 361. *Smaragdos duos in unum confuderunt, Trithemius, Sixtus Senenſis, Poſſevinus, Bellarminus, Miræus aliique paſſim*---] Abundance ſuch charges tell us how much greater Errours are charged on the greateſt Hiſtorians, than Mr. *Morrice* chargeth on me, with the leaſt ſhew of probability.

How many ſcore of Hiſtorians doth *Blondell* cite, who he thinks have falſly told us of a Pope *Joan*?

What abundance of faults would *Cauſabon* have found in *Baronius*, if he had lived to go through him as he began? And I profeſs my ſelf much more ignorant in Hiſtory than *Baronius*.

It would be tedious to number all the groſs Errours that *Voſſius* citeth *de ſcriptor. Græcis & Latinis*; *e.g.* in the *Later. p.* 230. *Hos duos confudit Trithemius---vid. quæ habet de Flac. Alcuino, p.* 290, 291, 292. *De Uſuardo, p.* 295. *cont. Gualterium & Baronium, Wicelium, p.* 296. *& cap.* 32. *de Turpino contra Trithemium & alios. Et cap.* 33. *de Walaſr. Strab. Tritthenius vehementer errat---Et Laur. Surium Bellarmin. in Catal. & alios nonnullos in errorem induxit.*

Vid. & quæ de Aimoino, p. 308, 309. *habet, & contra Poſſevinum, p.* 310. *& contra alios,* 311. *Et contra Baronium, Breulium, &c.* 312. *Et de Haimone cap.* 35. *contra Tritthenium, & de Rabano Mauro, p.* 315. *Et de Landulph. Sagace contra Caſ. Orlandium. De Anaſtaſ. c.* 35. *p.* 319. *De Hincmaro contra Tritthenium, c.* 36. *p.* 320. But I muſt not tire the Reader: Multitudes of ſuch Inſtances this one Author gives us: And how few Hiſtorians charge not others with Errours ſo much greater, and more than Mr. *M.* with any Truth accuſeth me of.

§ 3. As to his notes on my Titles of ſome Councils, it's paſt my memory, whether it was my careleſneſs, or (as I think) the Printer's Errour, to put [a Council at *Aranſican, Toletan, Regienſe*, for *Concilium Aranſicanum, Toletanum, Rhegienſe.*] If it was my act, I forgot that I had firſt put the Subſtantive in Engliſh. But he may oft find the ſame names uſed to his mind: And ſure it is no falſification of the Hiſtory.

§ 4. But

§ 4. But he hath a far greater charge againſt me, that *I did not apprehend the mind of the Council at* Tours; why ſo? The words are [*Nos vero ſiquos Lex perimi jubet, ſi cupiunt audire præconem, volumus ut convertantur ad vitam: Nam perimendi ſunt oris gladio & communione privandi ſi relicta ſibi ſeniorum decreta obſervare noluerint, &c.* Here he ſaith the meaning is, [The Eccleſiaſtical Laws do puniſh ſuch with perpetual Excommunications, yet this Council thought fit to mitigate it, *&c.*] The Queſtion is, Whether [*Quos Lex perimi jubet*, ſignifie Death, or Excommunication?] I take it to be Death, and that the Counſel ſaith [Though by the Law ſuch are to Die, if they will hear the Preacher, we will have them converted to Life: But ſo that if they will not be ſeparated, the Church Sword of Excommunication ſhall cut them off inſtead of Death.] My Reaſons why [*Lex perimi jubet*] ſignifieth Death, are from the expreſs foregoing words, [*Quia etiam Lex Romana conſtituit, ut quicunque ſacratam Deo Virginem vel Viduam ſortaſſe rapuerit, ſi poſtea eis de conjunctione convenerit, capitis ſententia feriantur. Item ſiquis, non dicam rapere, ſed attentare matrimonii conjungendi cauſa, ſacram Virginem auſus fuerit, capitis ſententia feriatur. Cum etiam in Chronicis habeatur de Virginibus Gentilium tempore, quæ ſe deæ Veſtæ ſacraverant, poſtmiſſo propoſito & corrupta virginali gratia, Legali ſententia vivas in terra ſuiſſe deſoſſas.* If none of this ſignifie Death, I confeſs I underſtand not Latine. I thought the Council meant Death by [*Lex perimi jubet,*] but they would be more merciful; which I blamed them not for, but noted here what many other Canons inſtance, where they alſo puniſh murder but with keeping men from Communion, that this agreeth with ſome Sectaries Opinion. I leave Mr. *M's.* great skill in expounding Councils here to any equal Judge. But if I ignorantly miſtake in all this, and neither [*Capitis ſententia feriantur*] nor [*Vivas in terra deſoſſas*] ſignifie Death, but Excommunication, yet many other Canons after cited fully tell us of the Biſhops Clemency.

CHAP. VII.

Mr M's. *Expoſition of Church Hiſtory tryed by his Expoſition of my own words: And* 1. *Of his falſe ſuppoſition that I am only for a Church of one Congregation meeting in one place.*

§ 1. IF ſo many repetitions of my Opinion cannot ſave Mr *M.* from ſo untrue a ſuppoſition of my ſelf, I muſt not too far truſt him, of the ſence of thoſe that he is as diſtant from as I. Yet this ſuppoſition running through all his book, ſhews that he wrote it againſt he knew not whom nor what. His foundation is becauſe I define a ſingle Church by *Perſonal preſent Communion.*

§ 2. I do ſo: And 1. Doth he think there is no ſuch thing as Chriſtians conjoyned for aſſembling in Gods ordinary worſhip, under the Conduct of their Proper Paſtors. I will not cenſure him ſo hardly as to think he will deny it. 2. Are theſe Churches or not. I ſuppoſe he will ſay, Yea. 3. But is there no *Perſonal Preſent Communion* but in publick worſhip. Yes ſure Neighbours who worſhip God in divers places, may yet live in the Knowledge and converſation of each other; and may meet for Election of Officers, and other Church buſineſſes, and may frequently exhort, reprove and admoniſh each other, and relieve each other in daily wants; and many meet ſometimes by turns in the ſame place, where they all cannot meet at once: We have great Towns, (like *Ipſwich*, *Plymouth Shrewſbury*, &c.) which have many Pariſhes, and yet Neighbourhood maketh them capable of [*Perſonal Communion in Preſence*] as diſtinct from [*Communion* by *Letters* or *Delegats with thoſe* that *we neither ſee nor know.*] And we have many great Pariſhes which have ſeveral Chappels, where the People ordinarily meet yet *per vices* ſome one time and ſome another come to the Pariſh Churches. Have theſe no Parochial *Perſonal Communion?*

To the *well-being* of a *Church*, I confeſs I would not have a ſingle Church of the loweſt ſpecies have too many, nor too few: No more than whoſe Perſonal Communion ſhould be frequent in Gods publick worſhip. Nor ſo few as ſhould not fully employ more Miniſters of Chriſt than one. But to the *Being* of a Church,

I only

I only require that the End of their Aſſociation be *Perſonal Communion* as diſtinct from diſtant Communion by Letters and delegates. And by [*Communion*] I mean not only the Sacrament.

§ 2. It is in vain therefore to anſwer a book that goeth on ſuch falſe ſuppoſitions, and a man that will face down the world that I plead for that which I never owned, and ſo frequently diſclaim.

CHAP. VIII.

Of his falſe ſuppoſition that I am againſt Dioceſan Biſhops, becauſe I am againſt that ſpecies of them which puts down all the Biſhops of ſingle Churches, and thoſe Churches themſelves.

§ 1. THis ſuppoſition goeth through almoſt all the book: In his preface he ſaith [*The ſuperiority of Biſhops over Preſbyters* is *acknowledged* by *Catholicks*, and *Schiſmaticks & Hereticks, &c. and yet this Church hiſtory would have us believe the Contrary.*] And ſo throughout.

§ 2. And yet to ſhew that he knew the Contrary in one place he confeſſeth it, and deſcribed part of my judgment, and ſaith that none will be of my mind in it, but it is ſingular to my ſelf: Yea I had in my Diſput. of Church Government, which he taketh on him in part to anſwer, and in my Treat. of Epiſcopacy which he alſo pretends to anſwer in part, told them of more ſorts of Biſhops than one that I oppoſe not, no not A. Biſhops themſelves: And one of them hereupon notes it as if I differed but about the name, ſubmitting to Dioceſans ſo they may but be called A. Biſhops. To whom I anſwered that A. Biſhops have Biſhops under them, ſo that though I over and over even to tediouſneſs tell them it is the *diſpoſing of all the firſt* or loweſt *Species of Biſhops* and *Churches*, and *Conſequently* all *Poſſibility of true Diſcipline that I oppoſe*, and ſubmit to any that overſee many ſuch Churches without deſtroying them and their privileges inſtituted by Chriſt] I ſpeak ſtill in vain to them: Theſe true Hiſtorians face down the world that I write whole books to the clean contrary.

CHAP. IX.

Of his ſuppoſition that I am an Independent, and yet that I plead for the cauſe of the Preſbyterians.

§ 1. THis is alſo a ſuppoſition that is part of the *Stamina* of his Book; and how far he is to be believed herein judge by the evidence following.

1. He knew what I ſaid before for three ſorts of Biſhops, 1. *Epiſcopi Gregis*, Overſeers of ſingle loweſt Churches, as of Divine Inſtitution: 2. For *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum*, or Preſidents. Biſhops *ejuſdem Ordinis, non ejuſdem Gradus*, in the ſame Churches, as of early Humane Inſtitution, which I reſiſt not. 3. *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum*, Overſeers of many Churches, which I ſuſpect to be Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, and of ſuch as *Timothy*, *Titus*, *&c.* in the continued ordinary part of their work, (exerciſing no other Power than they did:) Inſomuch that Dr. *Sherlock* would be thought ſo much leſs Epiſcopal than I, as that he ſaith, *It is Antichriſtian* to aſſert *Epiſcopos Epiſcoporum*.

§ 2. And Dr. *Parker* hath newly written a Book for Epiſcopacy, which I hear many deſpiſe; but for my part I take to be the ſtrongeſt that I have ſeen written for it theſe twenty years; but to no purpoſe againſt me; for it is but for Epiſcopacy in general, which I oppoſe not. It excellent well improveth the Arguments of the K. and Biſhops at the Iſle of *Wight*; even that one Argument that a Superiority of ſome over others being ſettled by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that Form muſt be ſuppoſed to continue, unleſs we have clear proof of the Repeal or Ceſſation. I have oft ſaid the ſame; I could never anſwer that Argument: But this will not juſtifie the depoſing of thouſands of Biſhops and Churches, and of their Diſcipline, to turn them all into two or three Dioceſans.

§ 3. Alſo he knoweth that I have written theſe 35 years againſt Lay-Elders; believing that the Colledge of Elders which of old aſſiſted the Biſhops, were none of them Lay-men, nor unordained, but of the ſame Order, though not Degree, with the Biſhop himſelf.

§ 4

§ 4. And I have alſo written that Synods of Biſhops or Preſbyters are but for Concord, and have not as ſuch by a major Vote a proper Government of the minor part or abſent: Much leſs that Claſſes, and other Aſſemblies, are the ſtated Church-Government which all muſt obey: And are the Presbyterians of any of the three forementioned Opinions?

§ 5. I ever held a neceſſity of manifold dependance of all Chriſtians and Churches. As all depend on Chriſt as their Head, ſo do all the People on the Paſtors, as their authorized Guides, whom they muſt not Rule, but be Ruled by, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12, 13. *Heb.* 13. 17, 24. And all theſe Churches depend on each other for Communion and Mutual Help, as many Corporations in one Kingdom. And frequent Synods well uſed, are greatly helpful to theſe ends: And the Command of doing as much as we can in Love and Concord, doth bind all the particular perſons to concur with the Synods in all things that tend to the Peace and Edification of the Church, or are not againſt it. And more than ſo, if the general Viſitors or Biſhops that take care of many Churches, do by God's Word direct, inſtruct, reprove, admoniſh the particular Biſhops and Churches, they ought with reverence to hear them and obey them. And if Independents really are for all this, why do theſe Accuſers repreſent them odiouſly, as if it were no ſuch matter, but they were meerly for Church-Democracy? Either you are not to believed in what you ſay of them, or of me.

§ 6. I know we have men that ſay, that on pretence of acknowledging all this Epiſcopacy, I put down all, becauſe I take from them the power of the Sword, and leave all to deſpiſe them if they pleaſe. *Anſ.* This indeed is the power that under the name of Epiſcopacy now too many mean. Biſhop *Bilſon* knew no Power but Magiſtrates by the Sword, and Miniſters by the Word. But why name I one man? It is the common Opinion of Proteſtants, and moſt ſober Papiſts, that Biſhops as ſuch have no power of force on Body or Purſe. But we deny not the forcing Power of the Magiſtrate. 3. But we heartily wiſh that they would keep it in their own hands, and never uſe it to force unwilling men into the Church, or to Church-Communion; high Priviledges which no unwilling perſon hath any right to. This is my Independency.

CHAP. X.

Of his Accuſation, That I make the Biſhops the Authors of all Hereſies and Schiſms, as diſtinct from Presbyters, Monks and People.

§ 1. THis alſo runs throughout his Book; and muſt ſuch Books be answered or believed? I never denyed the guilt and concurrence of others with them. I only ſay, That as Biſhops were the Chief, ſo they had the chief hand, as far as I can yet learn, in Hereſies and Schiſms, ſince they came to their height of Power, and ſpecially in thoſe grand Hereſies and Schiſms, which have broken, and keep the Churches in thoſe great Sects and Parties, which in Eaſt and Weſt it conſiſteth of to this day. I never doubted or denyed but that 1. The Hereſies that were raiſed before the Church had any Patriarchs, or the turgent ſort of Biſhops, were certainly raiſed without them. 2. And afterward ſometime a Presbyter began a Hereſie. 3. And the Biſhops were but as the Generals of the Army in all the Church Civil Wars. But I never denyed but the Prelatical Prieſts, Monks, and multitude were their obſequious Army.

§ 2. Mr. *M.* ſaith, That thoſe Biſhops that were Hereticks, were moſtly ſuch, or inclined to it before. *Anſw.* 1. Was there then a good Succeſſion of Ordination, when the World groaned to find it ſelf *Arian*? Were all theſe *Arians* before their Conſecration?

Anſw. 2. Were they not all Prelatical Presbyters that aſpired to be Biſhops, and ſo as they ſay had a Pope or Biſhop in their bellies. I never thought that Prelatical Prieſts that ſtudied Preferment, and longed to be Biſhops, had no hand in Hereſies nor Schiſms, no more than that the *Roman* Clergy are innocent herein, and the fault is in the Pope alone. What a deal then of this man's Book is loſt and worſe, on ſuch ſuppoſitions?

CHAP. XI.

Of his confident Accuſation, that I mention all the faults of the Biſhops, and none of their Goodneſs, or Good Deeds.

§ 1. THis alſo is a chief part of the *Warp* or *Stamen* of his Book. In his Preface he ſaith, ["*This Hiſtory of* "*Biſhops is nothing elſe but an Account of all the faults that Biſhops* "*have committed in the ſeveral Ages of the Church, without Any* "*Mention of their Good Actions, of their Piety and Severity of* "*their Lives; of their Zeal for the Faith, &c.*]

Anſw. 1. Whether this Fundamental Accuſation be true or falſe, let the Reader who loveth Truth ſee 1. In the very firſt Chapt. from § 41. to the end. 2. Through all the Book where I oft praiſe good Biſhops, good Councels, and good Canons, and good Books and Deeds. 3. In the two laſt Chapters of the Book, written purpoſely to hinder an ill uſe of the Biſhops faults.

In the firſt Chapter ["*Very many of the Biſhops themſelves were* "*humble, holy, faithful men, that grieved for the miſcarriages of* "*the reſt*: Though ſuch excellent perſons as *Gregory* of *Neocæ-* "*ſarea, Greg. Nazianz. Greg. Nyſſen, Baſil, Chryſoſtom, Augu-* "*ſtine, Hillary, Proſper, Fulgentius*, &c. were not very common, "no doubt but there were many that wrote not Books, nor "came ſo much into the notice of the World, but avoided con- "tentions and factious ſtirs, that quietly and honeſtly conduct- "ed the Flocks in the waies of Piety, Love, and Juſtice. And "ſome of them (as St. *Martin*) ſeparated from the Councils and "Communion of the prevailing turbulent ſort of the Prelates, "to ſignifie the *diſowning of their ſins*.]

Of the Antients before the world crowded into the Church, I never made queſtion: Such as *Clemens*, *Polycarp*, *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, and the reſt.

How oft I have praiſed holy *Cyprian*, and the *African* Biſhops and Councils, he ſometime confeſſeth.

What I ſay of *Atticus*, *Proclus*, and other peaceable Biſhops, you may ſee *p.* 17. and very oft. Yea of the Biſhops of many Sects, much of the *Albigenſes*, &c. *p.* 17, 18. Yea

Yea of the good that was done by the very worldly ſort *p.* 18, 19, 20. Yea of the Papiſts Biſhops that were pious *p.* 20. § 46.

And § 47. I vindicate the excellency of the Sacred Office. And § 53, 58, 59, 60. I plead for Epiſcopacy it ſelf in the juſtifiable ſpecies of it.

§ 2. But perhaps he will ſay, that at leaſt I ſay more of their faults than their virtues: I anſwer, of ſuch good Biſhops as *Cyprian, Baſil, Greg. Nazianzen, Chryſoſtom, Auguſtin, Hillary, Martin*, &c. I ſpeak of their virtues and nothing at all (that I remember) of their faults. Of ſuch as *Theophilus*, and *Cyril Alexandri.* and *Epiphanius*, *&c.* I ſpeak of their virtues and ſome of their faults (as the ſcripture doth of many good mens.) Of the more ambitious, turbulent ſort, I ſpeak only or moſtly of their faults: For I profeſs not to write a Hiſtory of their lives, but to inform the ignorant what Spirit it is that brought in Church tyranny and diviſions. I denyed none of their virtues, though it was not my work to record them.

While I am confuting the Errours of your book, do I wrong you unleſs I write a Catalogue of your good works. *Morney, Illyricus*, and many others have gathered a *Catalogue* of old witneſſes for Proteſtant Verities. And Biſhop *Morton* hath cited multitudes of Papiſts againſt their party: Have they wronged them becauſe they have not alſo cited all that the ſame ſaid for the *Roman* cauſe? I have mentioned the virtues of ſome of the Popes, even of *Greg.* 7. but of many others I have only mentioned their vices: This is not to deny any good that is in them: Nor do you accuſe your ſelves of any injuſtice when you tell the world how bad men the Parliaments have bin, and how bad *Cromwell* and the Armies, and how bad the Nonconformiſts are, and I in particular, without naming any of their good deeds or virtues: Becauſe it is not your buſineſs.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of his Accuſation that I do all in ſpite and malice againſt Biſhops, and as uſing ill language of them.

§ 1. *Anſw.* 1. Spite and Malice are heart ſins: If the ſame effect may come from other Cauſes, how know you that theſe are the Cauſe?

Anſ. 2. Is it from Spight and Malice that Proteſtants commonly deſcribe the vices of the Popes, ſuch as *Greg. 7. Sergius, Alexandr. 3. Boniface 8. Joh. 12.* and 13. & 22, & 23. & *Eugen. 4. &c.* And alſo that they ſo hardly ſpeak of the *Jeſuites*, Yea and Papiſts commonly? Sure it may come from ſome other cauſe.

Anſ. 3. Is it from Spight and Malice that you recite the tumults of the *Germar* Anabaptiſts, the faults of thoſe at *Munſter*, the Errours of *David George*, the many Enthuſiaſtick Sects deſcribed by *Beckman Exercit.* (of whom many as *Thaulerus, Kempis, Behmen* had much very commendable; and *Grotius* praiſed *Joh. Arndt.*) Is it from Malice that the Familiſts, Seekers, Quakers, Anabaptiſts, *&c.* are uſually by your party deſcribed by their faults, without any mention of their goodneſs?

Anſ. 4. Is it from Spight and Malice that your Party have written what they have done of the great faultineſs of the Nonconformiſts, both former and latter; and that *Calviniſts* are ſo odiouſly repreſented, that the Reformation by them is deſcribed by *Heylin* and others as Rebellious? That ſuch books are written as *Heylins Aerius Redivivus, H. Fowlis*, the *Evangel. Armatum*, The *Eccleſ. Polit.* the Friendly Debate, the Counterminer, the Vindicat. of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the pretended ſecond part, (which is a continued Calumny againſt my ſelf, ſo full of particular falſhoods as are not to be without a tedious Volume anſwered: And a multitude ſuch written to render the Nonconformiſts odious and unſufferable. If all theſe be not written in Malice, how know you that mine were?

Anſ. 5. And whereas ſome pretending moderation accuſe me of too bad provoking language, 1. Is there any Compariſon between the language of any of theſe books, or yours and Dr. *Sherlock's*

Sherlock's and mine? Read but Learned Godly moderate Biſhop *Downam* his Defence of his Viſit. ſermon, his frequent charges [of ſhameleſs, impudent Lying, and much more] againſt a Nonconformiſt that gave him no ſuch language. Read but the ordinary Writings of ſuch as Biſhop *Bancroft*, Dr. *Sutcliff*, and moſt others againſt the Old Nonconformiſts; and of the *Lutherans* againſt the *Calviniſts*, even men that I am perſuaded meant honeſtly, but by Faction were exaſperated, as *Hunnius*, *Brentius*, *Morlinus*, *Marbackius*, *Snepfius*, *Wigandus*, *Heſhuſius*, *Andreas*, *Selnecerus*, *Heerbrand*, *Calovius*, and many ſuch. Read but our Grammarians, ſuch as you may find in the many Volumes of the Collections of *Janus Gruterus*, even thoſe of *Cramer*, and *Phil. Paræus*, and others againſt himſelf; where *Fools*, *Knaves*, *Lyars*, *Sots*, and worſe, make up much of the ſtyle.

Read but our Old Grammarian Reformers againſt the Popiſh Prieſts, and Schoolmen, I mean *Eraſmus*, *Hutten*, *Faber*, and the reſt, what Scorns their Writings do abound with.

I will not refer you to the Queen of *Navarre*, and *Stephanus* his *World of Wonders*, againſt the Prieſts, leſt you think I approve of the exceſs.

Yea read but the Writings of our famous Learned Criticks, *Jul.* and *Joſeph Scaliger*, *Heinſius*, *Salmaſius*, &c. from whom the railing Jeſuite *Labbe* took advantage to ſay, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 820. [" *Ri-*
" *veto præiverat Joſephus Scaliger, homo utique modeſtiſſimus,*
" *qui Editores S. Irenæi vocat, clamoſos, maledicentiſſimos.*
" *Cercopas, Tartareos, Pyriphlegethontas, virulentiæ & probrorum*
" *concionatores, & editionem colonienſem, cloacam Sycophantiarum,*
" *Latrinam convitiorum, & ſtabulum inſcitiæ.*] Through God's great mercy, while *Malignity* is the Complexion of the Serpent's Seed, and *Lying* is their Breath, and *Murder* is their Work, the names of all theſe ſins are odious in the world, and guilt is impatient, and cannot endure its own name.

Should I but mention the Language of Papiſts, how they repreſent the holieſt Proteſtants as Lyars, Deceivers, Devils, intollerable, whom it is as lawful to kill as Dogs, Foxes or Toads, it would concern none but thoſe of you that uſt to ſay, I had rather be a Papiſt than a Puritane, or Presbyterian; or thoſe that renounce Communion with us, and own it with the Church of *Rome*; who are, alas, too many. Such Language as *Labbe*'s, *Vol.* 1 *p.* 819. is of the ſweeter ſort, *viz.* " *Quiſquis es ſalutis*

" *tuæ*

"*tua amans, Omnes illico Calviniſtas, Lutheranos, Socinianos*
"*Anabaptiſtas, ſimileſque generis humani peſtes, Cacodamonum*
"*inſtar execrabere.* This is but what we daily hear: But while we hear it in a Language ſo very like from the Papiſts, and the Pulpits and Preſs, and *Roger Le Strange* is become the Church's Advocate and Mouth, it will harden them that did ill joyn together *Popery* and *Prelacy* in their rejections.

Honeſt *Thuanus* is amiable and honourable for Speaking well of all that deſerved it, without partiality: But *Gerh. Voſſius* is put to defend his Father-in-law *Junius* againſt his unjuſt cenſure. Indeed *Junius* was a man of Eminent peaceableneſs and moderation, (I would *Arminius* and he had been the utmoſt proſecutors of that Controverſie, notwithſtanding Dr. *Twiſſes* undervaluing his skill in School Divinity) And few men were more unlike *Thuanus* his ill Character than *Junius*: But Dr *Manton* hath told me that he hath been fully informed that it was not *Junius* that *Thuanus* meant but another that dyed that year (which *Junius* did not) and that by ſome ill chance a wrong name was put in Contrary to *Thuanus* intent.

§ 2. Dr. *Burnet* is a man whom I much value and honour, and pleadeth much for peace and moderation, and therefore much the more amiable to me: I thank him for his reproof of me to my face; but becauſe he goeth on to vend it as juſt behind my back, where I cannot anſwer him, I muſt do it here. He ſaith that [*I began and that with unchriſtian, provoking language againſt the Conformiſts in my firſt Plea for peace, which cauſed all the ſucceeding heats.*]

Anſ. 1. I have to him and oft in print appealed to humanity and common ſence whether one that was ſeventeen years ſilent, & communicated in the Pariſh Churches, and under ſcorns, and ejection, impriſonment & mulcts did peaceably continue Communion with them without reply or ſelf defence, and never wrote againſt them, till they had long called out to him to give them an account of the reaſons of his Nonconformity, and then durſt not provoke them by a diſpute, but barely named the matters which we judge unlawful, profeſſing not to be the Accuſer of Conformiſts, but only to anſwer the Call of Parliament-men, Biſhops, and others that urged us, and threatned us if we would not tell them what we ſtuck at; and made this the Juſtification of their proſecution of many hundred men: I ſay, whether ſuch a

man had a Call to ſpeak? When the King Licenſed us, I had before briefly defended our Preaching as Licenſed: But being thus ſummoned by our Proſecutors and Superiours, I told them what we judged unlawful; and was this a beginning of the Flame? Was Seventeen years Poverty, Prohibition and Proſecution, and all this Importunity, no provocation or call to ſpeak? Did this begin? If he were in the Houſe of Correction, and were beaten but Seventeen years, or Seven years, to confeſs the Cauſe for which he ſuffered, and at laſt confeſſed it, and one ſhould ſay, This was the beginning of the ſtrife, Would he take this for a good Hiſtorian? And if he had written Hiſtory, would this report advance the credit of it?

§ 3. But the ſecond thing accuſed, is the unchriſtian Language of that Book. *Anſw.* Doth a general Accuſation ſignifie more ill of the accuſer, or of the accuſed, if it be not proved by particular Inſtances? I urged him to name the unchriſtian words, and I remember but two Inſtances he gave me.

The firſt is, that I uſe the word [*untruths*] againſt my Accuſers. And 1. I think the Reader will very rarely find that word in that Book. 2. Is this ſo harſh as the common charge of *Lying*, uſed even by the moſt Learned ſober Conformiſts? 3. I thought it had been a modeſt word: What ſhall a man ſay when ſuch Volumes of Slander are publiſhed againſt him and others, as tends to preach all their Neighbours into hatred and perſecution of them? Alas! Doth it increaſe our crime to ſay, It *is untrue?* How ſhall we then anſwer for our ſelves at any Bar? Is it tollerable voluminouſly to tell the World down-right falſhoods of us? and is it railing for us to ſay, [*They are untrue?*] What's this but like him that run a man thorow in wrath with his Sword, and indicted him for crying, oh? This is the Church Juſtice even of our moderate Hiſtorians.

§ 4. But he ſaith, I ſhould not call it [a *falſhood*, or *untruth*] but a *miſtake*. *Anſw.* This is a ſharper word; for it ſignifieth the fault of the miſtaker uſually; whereas by ſpeaking *de objecto*, that it is *falſe*, I leave it to others how far the reporter is to be blamed. But ſure moſt Logical *Diſputations* are Railings, if the words [*falſum*] and [*fallacia*] be ſuch.

§ 5. About a month or ſix weeks ago the Obſervator, the Churches Advocate publiſhed, That [" a Captain of Horſe of " the King's, had the fortune to be diſmounted, wounded and " ſtript,

"ſtript, and a Chaplain (naming me before) cut from about his "neck a Medal, which the King had given him, and the Soul-"diers ſpared in the heat of blood] I ſent him word how falſe this was: I never ſaw the man in my life that I know of; much leſs ever medled with him: But was in a Houſe where a Souldier brought a ſmall ſilver-guilt Medal, about the bigneſs of a big Shilling, and ſaid, he took it from about the neck of one Captain *Jennings*, whoſe Life he ſpared: He offered it to ſale, and no one offering him more, I gave him eighteen pence for it in 1643. as I remember: And about 1648. hearing where Captain *Jennings* was, ſuppoſing it might be of great uſe to him, I ſent it him as a gift by one Mr. *Sommerfield.*] And this ſlander is all the thanks I had. The Church-Advocate wrote me back, that he had it formally atteſted. I craved as a favour of him to tell me if Captain *Jennings* be living, how I might write to him. He anſwers me, that one was out of the way that he muſt firſt ſpeak with, and I ſhould ſhortly hear from him. The next I heard was as a ſecond part of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the foreſaid Book full of cruel falſhood, taken from my having been for the Parliament, and from many diſtorted words of mine: Now when this Book renders me worſe than a Jew, or Heathen, and unfit to live, ſome I fear will tell abroad that I am a Traitor, for ſaying, that [*It is ſlanderous or untrue.*]

§ 6. His ſecond Inſtance was theſe words of mine ["*Pardon* "*me for ſaying, I think that Mr.* Tombs *hath ſaid more like truth* "*for Anabaptiſtry, the late* Hungarian *for Polygamy, many for* "*Drunkenneſs, Stealing, and Lying, in caſes of Neceſſity, than ever* "*I yet read for the Lawfulneſs of all that I have here deſcribed.*]

Anſw. 1. Is there any Railing or unchriſtian Language in theſe words? which be they?

Anſw. 2. Do I here ſpeak of any but my ſelf and the Nonconformiſts? Do I not proteſt againſt accuſing others, and only ſay, what it would be to me, ſhould I conform? And muſt I not, when importuned by Biſhops, Prieſts and Rulers, ſay what I fear, leſt others ſhould think it intimateth their guiltineſs? Can I help that?

Anſw. 3. Did that man ever underſtandingly conſider the matter, who can doubt of the truth of what I ſay?

I. On the one ſide how *heinous* and *many* the ſins that *we fear* are, if we ſhould conform, I muſt not again name, for that's it that provoketh.

11. Now as to the Compariſon;

1. I'le appeal to Learned Biſhop *Barlow* whether Mr. *Tombs* hath not made the Caſe of Anabaptiſtry more difficult? Let them that deny it confute him better than I have done.

2. And why doth none anſwer the *Hungarians* book for Polygamy if it be eaſier done than the task in queſtion. I have known the man that maintained, that if a King had a barren wife, and his Kingdom like to be undone by a deſtructive ſucceſſor, he might as lawfully take another wife, as *Adams* Children might marry inceſtuouſly. And indeed the many unreproved inſtances of Polygamy in *Abraham, Jacob, Moſes, David, Solomon, &c.* will allow men more pretence for it, than ever I ſaw brought for all (I ſay, but For all) that I have named in that book.

3. And many Phyſicians have ſaid ſo much (though amiſs) for the lawfulneſs of a Drunken Cup inſtead of a Vomit & a Cordial in ſome diſeaſes, as have made it a harder caſe than ours ſeems to me: And I ſay not what it ſeems to others.

4. And *de neceſſario concubitu legantur quæ a medicis dicuntur de furore uterino.*

5. And for ſtealing nothing but preſent food to ſave life, he that Conſiders what God allowed a man to take that went through an Orchard, Vineyard or Corn-field, and what the Law of nature is, and whether the Kings Army on whoſe ſtrength the Safety of King & Kingdom depends, may not violently take food without the owners conſent rather than periſh, will find it harder to juſtifie the denying Chriſtendom and Communion to godly Perſons that ſcruple our ſort of God Fathers, Croſſing and Kneeling, *&c.* than to confute the aforeſaid ſtealing, or that which is meerly to ſave life.

6. And as for Lying in caſes of neceſſity, No leſs men of their own party than *Grotius de Jure Belli* and Biſhop *Jer. Taylor* in *Duct. Dubit.* have written for it. And though I be againſt it, and many Conformiſts for it, yet I will not deny but if the Life of the King might be ſaved among Enemies by a Lie; or the Life of a Patient by his Phyſicians deceiving him by a Lie, much more may be pretended for it, than for all the heinous ſin which I fear.

§ 7. And if theſe words be uncharitable Railing, what means have we left to give them that demand it, the Reaſons of our Nonconformity?

What

What if we had gone further, and taken it for a crying Church Crime, and called all the Clergy to Repentance? If that which we judge ſinful be not ſo, let them confute us: If it be ſo, and as great as we fear, is it not our duty to bewail it, and mourn for it? *Ezek.* 9.4. *Zeph.* 3. 17, &c. And is not mincing and extenuating great ſin, an implicit hardening men againſt Repentance? Should one Preach againſt Adultery, Fornication, Perjury, Murder, as about a doubtful Controverſie, or a ſmall thing, and ſay but [*Good men are on both ſides; I dare not ſay it is a ſin, though I dare not do it my ſelf: Or if it be one, it is but ſuch as good men are ordinarily guilty of: We muſt not judge one another.*] What were this but (worſe than *Eli* to his Sons) to cheriſh Sin, and Preach Impenitence, and ſerve Satan againſt the Evangelical Preaching of Repentance?

§ 8. For my Judgment, I profeſs it to be the duty of me, and all men, to uſe no Language of Good mens faults, no, though they turn Perſecutors upon ſome particular Errour, but what is conſiſtent with true Love to the men, and to cover their faults that are private, and meerly perſonal, as far as lawfully we may; but not to make light of publick, aggravated Crimes, ſuch as thoſe of *Hophni* and *Phinehas*; nor to ſhew indifferency towards Buyers and Sellers in the Temple; nor to ſtrengthen the Sin which threatneth a Land. If I thought that hundreds or thouſands of Chriſt's faithful Miniſters in any Country were unjuſtly hunted and forbidden to Preach the Goſpel to a People that truly need it, and this to the unavoidable dividing of the People, and the plain making way for a Forreign Juriſdiction, I ſhould take my ſelf as a guilty hinderer of Repentance, and Enemy to the Publick Safety, if I ſhould ſay only [*This is a doubtful Controverſie between Good, Wiſe, and Learned men.*]

Labbe ends his *To.* 1. as juſtifying his bittereſt Reproaches, with the Authority of Chriſt, *Peter*, *Paul*, *John*, *Jude*, *Ignatius*. And if he had only given great and publick ſins, the true names neceſſary to mens knowledge of them, for Repentance or Preſervation, thoſe Texts, and many more would have juſtified him.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Of his Suppoſition that I ſpeak againſt all Biſhops Councils.

§ 1. THis is not ſo. 1. I write oft for the great uſefulneſs of Councils. 2. I juſtly praiſe no ſmall number of them, eſpecially before the great Riſing of the Biſhops, for the firſt 300 or 400 years: He once acknowledgeth it of the *African* Councils: And he might have ſeen the like of many *Spaniſh*, and ſome *French* and *Germane* Councils: The *Engliſh* I little medled with. 3. The Firſt General Council at *Nice* I juſtly honour; yea and the Three following, and many more than three, for the ſoundneſs of their Faith, and as having many very laudable perſons in them; though I ſhew the ill effects of their contention and ambition.

I have heard ſome Conformiſts confeſs the great Learning and piety of the *Weſtminiſter* Synod in 1642. and of the Synod of *Dort*, where we had Delegates: and yet ſharplier ſpeak againſt the Acts of both by far, than I have done by any ſuch pious Perſons. Even they that have honoured Biſhop *Carlton*, Biſhop *Hall*, Biſhop *Davenant*, Dr. *Ward*, *&c.* that were there, have yet bitterly reproached the Decrees which they ſubſcribed. And how many as well as Dr *Heylin* have written and ſpoken ill of A. Biſhop *Uſher*, of A. Biſhop *Abbot*, A. Biſhop *Grindal*, A. Biſhop *Parker* (*yea of* A. Biſhop *Whitguift* for the *Lambeth*-Articles which I juſtifie not) who yet have a great honour both for Biſhops and their Councils.

§ 2. But I confeſs I am much of *Nazianzen*'s mind, and I think I am no more againſt them in the general than he was. And I am againſt our ſubjection to the Juriſdiction of Forreign Councils, and the uſe that the Pope and ambitious Clergy have made of them, to become Maſters of Princes and of the world: I am not for *Ebbo*'s *French* Council which depoſed *Ludov. Pius*, nor for making them either the Popes Army, or the Army of Patriacks againſt each other or of ſuch Princes as *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, *Theodoſius junior*, *Anaſtaſius Philippicus*, *Juſtinian*, *Irene*, *&c.* to fulfill their own miſtaken wills, how honeſt ſoever the men might

might be. Much leſs am I for ſuch work as the Council at *Lateran ſub Innoc.* 3 made, no nor that at *Florence*.

§ 3 And I take it for an Act of great Prudence in this my accuſer, while he is vindicating Biſhops Councils, to go no further than the four firſt General, when it is many hundred that I have mentioned. And is it not really an intimated accuſation of them to vindicate ſo few of above 400. And thoſe ſuch as for their faith we all own.

And yet a man would think by the ſtrein of his ſtyle and language that it were at leaſt the greater part of Councils that he were pleading for. I ſay ſtill as Biſhop *Bilſon* and other Proteſtants: Well ordered ſound Councils we owe great reſpect and honour to, for Counſel, ſtrength and Concord, but *ſubjection and Obedience*, ſaith he, *We owe Them* none, (ſave as we are bid, be all ſubject one to another, and ſerve one another in Love.)

§ 4. And now I leave any impartial man to judge what anſwer ſuch a book deſerved, which goeth upon all theſe foremention'd untrue ſuppoſitions.

CHAP. XIV.

Some mens Credit about ancient Church Hiſtory, may be conjectured at by their Reports of the Hiſtory of the time and place that we live in.

§ 1. BY their Hiſtory of late and preſent things we may conjecture at the Credit of not Mr. *M's.* but others of the Clergy-accuſers and Proſecutors of their Brethren. Almoſt all that I remember that write againſt me, agree in ſuch miſreporting matters of fact, yea the moſt publick, of the perſons, place and time, which our ſenſes have given us notice of, that we muſt believe them with as great difficulty as we muſt believe Tranſubſtantiation, even in oppoſition to all our ſenſes and experience. And whether thoſe men be fit Vindicaters of the Biſhops and Councils above a Thouſand years ago (which are blamed by the Hiſtorians of their own Age, and by their own Confeſſions, and by their moſt fervent Defenders) who notoriouſly miſreport the perſons, and actions of their own Place and Age, I think it is not hard to judge. I will

I will inſtance in Twenty particulars of publick notice; for thoſe againſt particular perſons, even my ſelf, are not to be numbred.

I. It is now commonly taken for true, that the preſent Nonconformiſts, who gave in their Deſires for Concord 1660. are of the ſame Judgment as thoſe called Nonconformiſts heretofore, and whatever can be raked up out of *Chriſt. Goodman*, *Knox*, *Kilby*, or is reported by *Bancroft*, is partly chargeable on them, when as their propoſed Deſires yet ſhew the world that they never made any motion againſt many things by thoſe aforeſaid ſcrupled, in Doctrine, Worſhip, and Ceremony.

And it is commonly ſuppoſed by them, that the preſent Conformity is but the ſame as the Old, and the Caſe no harder to us: And this notwithſtanding all the ſtill viſible Acts and Alterations, and Additions, which atteſt the contrary to all the world.

II. In moſt of their Invectives the preſent Nonconformiſts are argued againſt, as if they had been in the Civil War againſt the King; or had been guilty of it more than the Conformiſts. And that War is made a Reaſon of their Silencing; whereas ſo few of them had any hand in it, that I have many times told them, that if they will Silence none but thoſe that they can prove guilty of any War, or Rebellion, or Sedition, the reſt of us will give them a thouſand Thanks, though we ſuffer our ſelves. Few of the preſent Nonconformiſts were then in the Miniſtry, and of thoſe few that were, few now living meddled with War.

III. They are ſo confident that the Parliament and Army that began the War in *England*, were Nonconformiſts, yea Presbyterians, and not of the Church of *England*, that Mr. *Hinkley*, & here Mr. *Morrice*, make a renouncing of their Senſes or Underſtandings neceſſary to the believing of it. And yet they might as well tell us, that they were all Turks or Papiſts. Are not a Parliament and an Army things publick enough to be known in the ſame Age? When we name to them the Chief Lords and Commons, and Chief Commanders, yet (and lately) living, who are known ſtill to live in their own Communion; and when we challenge them to name Three Presbyterians that were then in the Houſe of Lords, or the Houſe of Commons; or many that were at firſt Commanders in the Army; and we name them the Men that then Commanded, who were commonly known

to

to be Conformists of the Church of *England*. And if they will not believe their present practice and profession they may yet go to them and be satisfied from their own mouths what were their former Principles. I have told them of a most credible Member of that Parliament yet living, who hath oft profest to me that he knew but one Presbyterian in the House of Commons when the war began, and I have named that one man to them, to try if they can name another. I expect not that they should believe me, or such other concerning those whom we knew: But they may believe the men themselves yet living, & their most familiar Friends.

Yea the Records of many foregoing Parliaments, with *Laud's* Life written by Dr. *Heylin* fully sheweth them that the difference arose 1. About the fear of Popery, (and *Arminianism* as they thought tending towards it) 2. About Property, Loanmony, Knight-mony and after Ship-mony, &c. 3. About Imprisonment of members and other Gentlemen. And these were still the quarrel.

But saith Mr. *M. How then shall we believe our senses. Ans.* See Reader, whether his most confident Errours about past things be any wonder. He is not so sure of what he saith of the old Prelates, or the *Nestorians, Eutychians, &c.* as he is that he must believe his Senses: And his very senses tell him that a Parliament, even Lords, Commons, and an Army, many of whom are yet living, were of another opinion in Religion than ever they were then acquainted with, and which was known to very few in *England* till afterward. And this contrary to their Profession and practice and the senses of their acquaintance. Lords are Persons of so publick notice that they may easily yet be informed of the living and the dead: In the Army the Chief Commanders were the E. of *Essex*, the E. of *Bedford* (yet living) Sir *John Merrick*, the E. of *Peterborough*, *Dalbiere*, the E. of *Stamford*, the Lord *Hastings* (E. of *Huntington*) the Lord *Rochford* (E. of *Dover*) the Lord *Fielding* (E. of *Denbigh*) the Lord *Mandevile* (E. of *Manchester*) the Lord *Roberts* (now Earl of *Radnor* and President of his Majesties Council) the Lord Sr. *Johns*, (killed at *Keinton* Fight.) Only the Lord *Say*, and Lord *Brook* were known Independents; and whether the Lord *Wharton* (yet living) was then for Bishops or against them I know not; but all the rest were of the Church of *England*. And so were the other Collonels, Sir *Henry Cholmley*, the late Lord *Hollis*, Col. *Will. Bampfield*, Col.

Tho. Grantham, Col. *Tho. Ballard*, C. Sir *William Fairfax*, Col. *Charles Essex*, Col. Lord *Willoughby* of *Parham*, Col. Sir *Will. Waller*, Col. *Edwin Sandys*, Cap. Lord *Grey* of *Grooby*; and I think then Sir *Will. Constable* and Col. *Hampden*. What mind Sir *Will. Balfoore* was of I know not: But I know his Country man Col. *Brown* was too far from a Puritane.

But saith Mr. *M.* [1. *It's well the Bishops had no share in it*] *Ans.* Let *Heylin* tell you what hand the difference between A. Bishop *Abbats* Church of *England* and *Laud*'s then little Party had in the preparations. 2. And was the A. Bishop of *York* no Bishop, who afterward was a Commander for the Parliament.

But saith he, [*I pray where were the Presbyterians when the Parliament took up Arms: Were they not then in being?*] *Ans.* An excellent Historian! that maintaineth Parliament and Army were such, as he knows not whether they were then in being. Yes Sir, they were in *Holland*, and *France* and *Geneva*, and *Scotland*; and in *England* there was one *John Ball*, and one Mr. *Langley*, and a few more such old Nonconformists that never were in Arms, and old *John Dod*, and one Mr. *Geree* that was against the war and dyed for grief of the Kings death: But among those called Puritans, few knew what Presbytery was, till the *Scots* afterward brought it in. Much less did Lords, Commons, and Army know it. In your sense Sir they were not then in being, and therefore could not fight.

It appears by *Bancroft* and others that there had been once Presbyterians in *England*: But they were dead, and few even of the few Nonconforming Ministers succeeded them in the Study of that point.

But saith he, [*Were they none of them in the house*] *Ans.* Yes, one [*or did they protest against the proceedings of the Episcopal and Erastians? Ans.* That one went with them. And *Non entis non sunt accidentia.*]

But saith he [*Can Mr. B. believe* (or *think any one else so weak as to be imposed on in a matter so notorious*) *that it was a Parliament of Episcopals*, and *Erastians and not Presbyterians that began the war?*]

Ans. Thus youngmen that know not whom they talk of can controle the most publick matter of fact by their conjectures. Go ask the worthy Master of the Rolls Sir *Harbottle Grimston*, whose Speeches were then printed: Ask Sir *Joh. Maynard* His Majesties

jeſties Sergeant at Law who was one of them; or any other of them yet living. Ask them whether they knew themſelves and their companions better than you, who it ſeems knew them not.

But ſaith he [*Were they Epiſcopals that voted down Epiſcopacy Root and Branch before the war begun*] *Anſ.* 1. Have you proved that they did ſo? 2. Do you think that a contradiction? 1. They had got a belief that Biſhop *Laud* had got ſuch men into the Seats as were for a Syncretiſm with the Papiſts (deſcribed by *Heylin*) and againſt the Subjects Property and Liberty. And it was the *Men* and not the Office that offended them. 2. But becauſe they were willing of the favour of the *Scots*, and thoſe *Londoners* who were againſt the Biſhops, they pleaſed them by voting down the preſent frame, intending to ſet up a moderate Epiſcopacy in its ſtead; Yea long after this when many Learned Divines in the Aſſembly declared themſelves for Epiſcopacy, but not for Deans, Chancellors, &c. They altered the Covenant ſo as to deſcribe the preſent frame only: And when the Houſe of Lords took the Covenant, Mr. *Coleman* (an *Eraſtian*) gave it them openly, declaring, that it was not meer Epiſcopacy that this Covenant renounced, but only the *Engliſh* deſcribed Complicate form. And could they have had ſuch Biſhops as *Abbot* and the old Church of *England*, they had never gone thus far. 3. And they thought not Epiſcopacy itſelf ſo neceſſary, (though if moderate the beſt ſort of Governments) as to hazard all for it, which they thought had been in danger. Even in 1640 *July* 17. They Voted a Dioceſan in every County, with Twelve Divines to Govern.

But, ſaith he, [*Were they Epiſcopals that Petitioned the King at* York *for Reformation in Diſcipline and Worſhip then*? i. e. *for aboliſhing Epiſcopacy and Common-Prayer*?] *Anſw.* 1. Reforming is not Aboliſhing. 2. I anſwered that as to the laſt. When they feared that the Old Houſe would fall on their heads, they were for pulling of it down, and building a New one, after ſuch a Model as Biſhop *Uſher* after gave, and the *Germane*, *Swediſh*, and *Daniſh* Churches have; which they called the Primitive Epiſcopacy: But before they could do it, they needed the *Scots* help, who brought in the Covenant, which they choſe rather than to fall into the hands of thoſe of whom they had ſuch thoughts and fears, as I need not now deſcribe. *Prin*'s Hiſtory of *Laud*'s Tryal deſcribeth them.

I would ask this confident Hiſtorian (*whoſe ſenſes tell him what Religion men were of contrary to their daily practice of communicating in the Pariſh-Churches conformably*) whether the Longeſt Parliament of all, which made the Acts of Uniformity, the Corporation and Veſtry Acts, the Two Acts againſt Conventicles, the *Militia* Act, &c. were Presbyterian or Epiſcopal? Verily, if theſe were Presbyterians, I am none, nor ever will be: We ſhall then have a ſtrange definition of a Presbyterian, ſuch as will take in Biſhop *Sheldon*, Biſhop *Morley*, Biſhop *Gunning*, and ſuch others. If not, did not the fear of Popery make that very Parliament begin to look ſo ſowrely on the Clergy, as produced that which I need not tell you of? And did not moſt of the ſame men meet in the next Parliament after, and look yet more ſuſpiciouſly on the Clergy? And the next yet more? And doth it follow that they were not Epiſcopal but Presbyterian? But ſome men are confident againſt the Sun-light, and the moſt notorious Publick Evidence. But I muſt confeſs that ſuch have ſhaken my belief of the meer Moral Evidence of moſt Hiſtory, and left me only certain of that which hath Evidence, which is truly Natural, in the Natural Impoſſibility of Conſpiracy in a Lie.

There were men heretofore that would ſwear that man was a Puritane, who would not ſwear and drink with them, and would pray in their Families, and read the Scriptures on the Lord's Day, while others were dancing. And the word [*Puritane*] is now vulgarly changed into [*Presbyterian*] (by the Clergies Conduct.) And there are ſome Clergy-men that will ſay, a man is a Presbyterian, who reproves them for Drunkenneſs and Swearing, and other Crimes, ſpecially if he would not have Nonconformiſts ruined and laid in Gaol with Rogues. In this ſenſe I deny not but Lords, Commons and Army, had many Puritanes or Presbyterians among them, who yet never knew what Presbytery was.

But, ſaith Mr. *M.* [*Were they Epiſcopal who pray the King at* Oxford *to aboliſh A. Biſhops and Biſhops, &c. that entred into a Solemn League and Covenant againſt Epiſcopacy, and for Reforming the Church after the Presbyterian Platform, and ſet up Presbytery by ſo many Ordinances?*]

Anſw. Diſtingue tempora is none of this Hiſtorians Principles. How long after the War begun was this Petition at *Oxford*, this Covenant, and theſe Ordinances? He proveth them Preſ-

byterians

byterians at first when they knew not what it was, because they were for Presbytery a year or two after: *Negatur Sequela.* The *Scots* taught afterwards the Assembly, and them that which they never knew before, 2. And all these Petitions & Ordinances shewed not what they preferred as best, but what they preferred before expected ruine. The Issue proved this, and *Heylin* confesseth it, and saith, They never set up Presbytery in any one place (which yet is not true, though they did not force it.)

3. Do you not know now living, those Episcopal Conformists, who refuse no part of your Conformity, and are much against Presbytery, who since the Discovery of the Papists Plot, are so much afraid of Popery, and so confident that too many of the Clergy are prepared for it, that a little more would turn them from you, though they love Presbytery as little as they love your selves.

In a word, The Old Clergy and the Parliament Men agreed. The New Clergy in Bishop *Laud*'s time distasted them, & the *Scots* Presbyterians helping them in their straits, partly turned some of them, and partly imposed on them unpleasing conditions.

But saith he, [*The Erastians and Independents were at first inconsiderable, and acted joyntly with the Presbyterians, &c.*]

Answ. Thus is History delivered to the deluded World! Neither Independency nor Presbytery were understood by many till the War was begun. The *Scots* Commissioners by degrees acquainted them with Presbytery, and Mr. *Burton*'s Protestation Protested, and the five Dissenters with Independency: Two or three Independents were in the House of Lords, and some few in the House of Commons: It was Episcopal-men that made up the main Body: These were of two sorts: The one sort thought Episcopacy of Divine Institution, but not Chancellors, Deans and Chapters, Arch-Deacons, Officials, *&c.* The other sort thought that Episcopacy, not rampant, was the best Government *Jure humano*; But that the Magistrate being Chief, might set it up, or take it down, as he see most for the common good. These were called by some *Erastians:* And that these at first were inconsiderable, is History written in despight of Evidence. Let any man 1. Read what Parliaments formerly said; 2. And what many *English* Divines wrote for the *Jus humanum* against the *Jus Divinum*; and what Testimony *Prin* hath given of it; 3. And what Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath produced for it in his *Irenicon*;

4. And

4. And how commonly it was owned by Conformists then in Conference; 5. And how commonly the Lawyers were for the Humane Right; 6. Yea and the Civilians themselves; and then let him take this Historian's word, if he tell Posterity that the Parliament and Army were not *English* men.

IV. These Historians candidly tell the world, that the Nonconformists, who offered their Desires for Concord 1660. were Presbyterians, and so are most of the Nonconformists now, Whereas they never made one motion for Presbytery, for Lay-Elders, for Ruling Classes or Assemblies, nor against Episcopacy; but only offered the Paper called A. Bishop *Usher*'s Reduction of Episcopacy to the Primitive Form; wherein neither A. Bishops, nor Bishops, nor Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, were taken down, or any of their Revenues, Lordships, or Parliament-Power. This is Presbytery with these Historians.

V. They make the world believe that the main Body of the Conformists, are such as suffered for the King, or complied not with the Directory and Times of Usurpation: Whereas it's publickly notorious, that there are about 9000 Parish-Churches in *England*, besides many hundred Chappels, & many Churches that had more than one Minister. And almost all these complied with the Times or Directory, as the Nonconformists did: And of all these, it was but about 2000 that Conformed not; so that 7000 or 8000 of them that had kept in, did on a sudden turn Conformists. And divers that had been in Arms for the Parliament: Yea, some that had written for the Engagement when I wrote against it; yea some that had spoken or written *tantum non* a Justification of the Killing of the King. And of those that joyned with us in our Propolals for Concord, Dr. *Worth*, and Dr. *Reignolds* were made Bishops, and divers others did Conform.

VI. These Historians would make the world believe that the Present Church, and such as they, did more than the Parliamentarians, and Presbyterians, and Nonconformists, to restore the King; when it is notoriously known, how oft their Attempts were defeated, and what the *Scots* Army under *Hamilton* underwent, to say nothing of the next; and of the Lord *Delamore*'s Attempt, and what the Restored Parliament did: But sure I am, that the Old Parliament Souldiers, and Presbyterian Commanders and Souldiers in General *Monk*'s Army, with those in *England* and *Ireland* that joyned with him, and Sir *Thomas Allen* Lord

Lord Mayor, with the *Londoners*, at the perſuaſion of the Preſbyterian Miniſters, drawing General *Monk* to joyn with them, did the main work, which the Council and Parliament after finiſhed. When moſt of theſe men that will not endure the oblivion of Diſcords, nor the Reconciling and Union of the King's Subjects, do but ſtart up to revile others, and blow the Coals again, and reap the fruit of other mens labours, that deſire but to live in Peace.

VII. That there are able worthy men that Conform, we are far from denying; and we earneſtly deſire their Concord, and the ſucceſs of their Labour, and I hope love them as our ſelves. But whereas the Hiſtory of this Party doth proclaim how much better and abler Miniſters than the Nonconformiſts are generally put into their Places, that are no Novices or Ignorant Youths, no Drunkards, nor ſcandalous, but more laborious, skilful Labourers, I will ſay nothing, but let the Countries judge.

VIII. And whether it be true that there is no need of the Nonconformiſts Miniſtry, but the Churches are ſufficiently ſupplied without them, both as to the number and quality of their Teachers, I have in my Apology enquired; and with godly men it's eaſily judged.

IX. And whether it be true, that it was only for the Kings or Biſhops cauſe that the Parliament put out all, or moſt of them that were heretofore removed, I leave to the Witneſſes and Articles againſt them. I am ſure I and my neighbour Miniſters petitioned that none that were tolerable pious Miniſters, might be put out for being for the King or Biſhops.

X. It is commonly now recorded and reported that the Preſbyterians and thoſe that now conform not put down Catechizing, and turned the Creed, Lords prayer and Decalogue out of the Church Service. Whereas (if ſome few Independents did any of this, it is more than I know, but) in all our Countrey, and where I came, I remember no Churches that did not uſe the Creed openly at their baptizing any, and the Decalogue frequently read out of *Exod.* 20. or *Deut.* 5. and the Lords prayer frequently; as we did conſtantly. But ſome thought that we were not bound to uſe it every time they prayed. And the Directory commendeth all theſe to them. And all our Countrey agreed not only to Catechize publickly, but to take larger time

on

on the week daies to Catechize every family.

XI. These Historians say that I and such others take the things which we conform not to, to be but inconveniences and not sins; And that we keep the Nation in Schisme while we confess the things to be but Indifferent And our writings are visible in which we profest the contrary, and laboured by many arguments to prove it and protested that we would conform if we took them not to be sins. And we gave in a Catalogue of what we judged to be sins: And this before the New Conformity was imposed: And since the fiercest displeasure is against us for telling them what we account Sin, and how great: When many years together our Rulers and the People were told that we confessed them indifferent and refused them but to avoid offending our followers.

XII. We frequently hear from them that we oppose Episcopacy because we cannot be Bishops our selves: When its known that nothing could more put men out of all such hopes than the Presbyterians Endeavours that both their power and wealth should be taken down: And he that hath any desires of a Bishoprick should sure be for the keeping of them up. And the same men reprove us for refusing Bishopricks and Deanries, and say we did it to please the People.

XIV. The new Historians would make us believe that the Reformed Church of *England* before Bishop *Lauds* time were of their mind that now call themselves Bishops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, in holding as they do, that there is an Universal humane Soveraignty with Legislative and Judicial power over all the Churches on earth: and that this is in Councils, or an Universal Colledge of Bishops; of which the Pope may be allowed to be president, and *Principium Unitatis &c.* and that he must be obeyed as Patriarch of the West; and so we must be under a forreign Jurisdiction. Whereas it is notoriously known that before Bishop *Lauds* time the doctrine of this Church was quite Contrary, as may be seen at large in the Apology, the Articles of Religion, the writings of the Bishops and Doctors; Yea they writ copiously to prove that the Pope is Antichrist, and put it into their Liturgy. And Dr. *Heylin* tells us that the Reason why Bishop *Laud* got it out was, that it might not offend the Papists and hinder our reconciliation with them; And the Oath of Supremacy sweareth us against all forreign Jurisdiction.

XV. The same Historians would make us believe that these

mens

mens doctrine is now the doctrine of the Church of *England* or agreeable to it. Whereas the Oath of Allegiance is ſtill in force, and ſo are the Homilies, and the Articles of Religion and the Laws and Canons for the Kings Supremacy againſt all forreign Juriſdiction. And there is no change made which alloweth of their doctrine: And the Church doctrine muſt be known by its publick writings, and not by the opinions of new riſen men.

XVI. The new Hiſtorians make the Nonconforming Miniſters to be men groſly ignorant, preaching falſe doctrine, of wicked principles and lives, and not fit to be ſuffered out of Gaols. And yet theſe 19. or 20. years how few of them have been convict of any falſe doctrine? And I have not heard of four in *England* that have ever been convict ſince they were caſt out, of being once drunk, or fornicating, cheating, ſwearing, or any immorality, unleſs preaching and not ſwearing, Subſcribing, &c. be ſuch, nor for falſe doctrine.

XVII. The new Hiſtorians have made thouſands believe that the doctrine or opinions of the Nonconformiſts is for ſedition and rebellion; And that it is for this that they refuſe to renounce the obligation of the Covenant as to all men beſides themſelves and that they refuſe to ſubſcribe that it is not lawful on any pretence whatſoever to take Arms againſt any Commiſſioned by the King. Whereas we have at large in a ſecond Plea for peace opened our judgments about Loyalty and obedience, and none of them will tell us what they would have more, nor where our profeſſion is too ſhort or faulty. Nor have they convict any of my acquaintance of preaching any diſloyal doctrine.

XVIII. Yea they have by writing, preaching and talking made multitudes believe that the Nonconformiſts or Presbyterians have been long hatching a rebellion againſt the King, and have a Plot to take down Monarchy under pretence of oppoſing Popery. And how far theſe Hiſtorians are to be believed, true Proteſtants by this time partly underſtand.

XIX. Yea theſe Hiſtorians have made multitudes believe that the Parliaments that have been diſolved here of late years have been deſigning to change the Government of Church and ſtate, under pretence of oppoſing Popery. As if that Parliament that did that for them and againſt us which is done, and made all the Acts which are for the Renunciation of the Covenant, and for all the Declarations, Subſcriptions and Practices Impoſed, and for Fining us 20 *l.* and 40 *l.* a Sermon, and laying us in Gaols,

had been for Nonconformiſts, and againſt Epiſcopacy; and they that made the *Militia* Act, and ſuch other had been againſt the King, or his Prerogative: Or the other following had not been of the ſame Religion.

XX. But the boldeſt part of their Hiſtory, is their deſcription of the two ſorts of the People in *England*, thoſe that are for the preſent Nonconformiſts, and thoſe that are againſt them. Thoſe that are againſt them, they account the moſt Religious, Temperate, Chaſt, Loyal, Credible, and in a word, the beſt people through the Land (for of our Rulers I am not ſpeaking.) And thoſe that are for the Nonconforming Miniſters, they deſame as the moſt proud, hypocritical, treacherous, diſloyal, covetous, falſe, and in a word, the worſt people in the Land; or as *Fowlis* ſaith, the worſt of all mankind, and unfit to live in humane Society. How long will it be ere the ſober people of this Land believe this Character? One would think that the quality of the common Inhabitants of the Land ſhould not be a Controverſie, or unknown thing. All that I will ſay to this Hiſtory, is, to tell the Reader the utmoſt of my obſervation and experience from my Youth up, concerning theſe two ſorts of men.

Where I was bred before 1640. (which was in divers places) I knew not one Presbyterian Clergy man, nor Lay, and but three or four Nonconforming Miniſters. Nay till Mr. *Ball* wrote for the Liturgy and againſt *Can*, and *Allen*, *&c.* and till Mr. *Burton* Publiſhed his Proteſtation proteſted, I never thought what Presbytery or Independency were, nor ever ſpake with a man that ſeemed to know it: And that was in 1641. when the War was brewing. In the place where I firſt lived, and the Country about, the People were of two ſorts: The generality ſeemed to mind nothing ſeriouſly but the body and the world: They went to Church and would anſwer the Parſon in Reſponds and thence go to dinner, and then to play: They never prayed in their families, but ſome of them going to bed, would ſay over the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, & ſome of them the *Hail Mary*: All the year long, not a ſerious word of holy things, or the Life to come, that I could hear of, proceeded from them. They read not the Scripture, nor any good Book or Catechiſm. Few of them could read, or had a Bible: They were of two ranks; the greater part were good Husbands as they called them, and ſavoured of nothing but their buſineſs or Intereſt in the World; the reſt were Drunkards: Moſt were Swearers, but not equally: Both

ſorts

ſorts ſeemed utter ſtrangers to any more of Religion than I have named; and loved not to hear any ſerious talk of God, or Duty, or Sin, or the Goſpel, or Judgment, or the Life to come: But ſome more hated it than others: The other ſort were ſuch as had their Conſciences awakened to ſome regard of God and their Everlaſting State; and according to the various meaſures of their underſtanding, did ſpeak and live as ſerious in the Chriſtian Faith, and would much enquire what was Duty, and what was Sin, and how to pleaſe God, and to make ſure of Salvation; and made this their Buſineſs and Intereſt, as the reſt did the world. They read the Scripture, and ſuch Books as *The Practice of Piety*; *and* Deut's *Plain Man's Path Way*; *and* Dod *on the Commandments*, &c. They uſed to pray in their Families, and alone; ſome on the Book, and ſome without: They would not Swear, nor Curſe, nor take God's Name lightly: They feared all known ſin: They would go to the next Pariſh-Church to hear a Sermon when they had none at their own; would read the Scripture on the Lord's Day, when others were playing: Theſe were, where I lived, about the number of two or three Families in twenty; and theſe by the reſt were called Puritanes, and derided as Hypocrites and Preciſians, that would take on them to be Holy: And eſpecially if they told any one of his Swearing, Drunkenneſs, or Ungodlineſs, they were made the common ſcorn. Yet not one of many of them ever ſcrupled Conformity to Biſhops Liturgy or Ceremonies, and it was godly Conformable Miniſters that they went from home to hear: And theſe Miniſters being the ableſt Preachers, and of more ſerious Piety, were alſo the Objects of the Vulgar Obloquy as Puritanes and Preciſians themſelves; and accordingly ſpoke againſt by many of their Tribe, and envyed for being preferred by godly men.

This being the Condition of the Vulgar where I was, when I came into the acquaintance of many Perſons of Honour and Power, and reputed Learning, I found the ſame ſeriouſneſs in Religion in ſome few before deſcribed, and the ſame daily ſcorn of that ſort of men in others, but differently cloathed: For theſe would talk more bitterly, but yet with a greater ſhew of reaſon againſt the other, than the ignorant Country People did: And they would ſometime talk of ſome Opinions in Religion, and ſome of them would uſe ſome of the Common-Prayer in

their Houſes, and ſome of them would ſwear, but ſeldom, and ſmall Oaths, and lived ſoberly and civilly; but ſerious talk of God or Godlineſs, or that which tended to ſearch and reform the Heart and Life, and ſeriouſly prepare for the Life to come, or to awaken Souls to a care of their State and Salvation, they would at leaſt be very weary to hear, if not deride as Puritanical. Mr. *Robert Bolton* a Conformiſt, hath fully opened all this of both ſorts in his *Diſcourſe of True Happineſs*, and *Directions for walking with God*: And how the name *Puritane* was then uſed.

This being the Fundamental Diviſion where I came, ſome of theſe that were called Puritanes and Hypocrites, for not being Hypocrites, but ſerious in the Religion they profeſſed, would ſometimes get together, and as Drunkards and Sporters would meet to drink and play, they would (in ſome very few places, where there were many of them) meet after Sermon on the Lord's Daies to Repeat the Conforming Miniſters Sermon, and ſing a Pſalm, and Pray. For this, and for going from their own Pariſh-Churches, they were firſt envied by the Readers, and dry Teachers, whom they ſometime went from, and next proſecuted by Apparitors, Officials, Archdeacons, Commiſſaries, Chancellors, and other Epiſcopal Inſtruments: For in former times there had been divers Presbyterian Nonconformiſts, who earneſtly pleaded for Pariſh-Diſcipline (as *Bucer* alſo did in *Oper. Anglic.*) And to ſubdue theſe, divers Canons were made; which ſerved the turn againſt theſe Meetings of the Conformable Puritanes, and going from their own Pariſh-Churches; though the Old Presbyterians were dead, and very few ſucceeded them. About as many Nonconformiſts as Counties were left; and thoſe few moſt ſtuck at Subſcription and Ceremonies, which were the hinderance of their Miniſtry; and but few of them ſtudied or underſtood the Presbyterian or Independent Diſciplinary Cauſes.

But when theſe Conformable Puritanes were thus proſecuted, it bred in them hard thoughts of the Biſhops and their Courts, as Enemies to ſerious Piety, and Perſecutors of that which they ſhould promote: Suffering bred this Opinion and Averſation. And the ungodly Rabble rejoyced at their troubles, and applauded the Biſhops for it, and were every where ready to ſet the Apparitors on them, or to ask them, Are you holier or wiſer than the Biſhops? And their Accuſations were readily entertained

tertained: This much inclined them to hearken to them that were averſe to Conformity, when ſuch roſe up, and to ſuch as were more againſt the Biſhops, than there was cauſe; ſo that by this time, the Puritanes took the Biſhops to be Captains and the Chancellors, Archdeacons, Commiſſaries, Officials and Paritors, their Officers, and the Enemies of ſerious Godlineſs, and the vicious Rabble to be as their Army, to ſuppreſs true conſciencious Obedience to God, and care of mens Salvation. And the cenſured Clergy and Officers took the Cenſurers to be Schiſmaticks, and Enemies to the Church, unfit to be endured, and fit to be proſecuted with reproach and puniſhment; ſo that the ſaid Puritanes took it to be but the common Enmity that ſince *Cain*'s daies hath been in the world, between the Serpent's and the Woman's Seed: And when the perſons of Biſhops, Chancellors, Officials, Apparitors, *&c.* were come under ſuch a repute, it was eaſie to believe what ſhould be ſaid againſt their Office. And the more the Biſhops thought to cure this by puniſhment, the more they increaſed the Opinion, that they were perſecuting Enemies of Godlineſs, and the Captains of the Prophane.

And when ſuch ſinful Beginnings had prepared men, the Civil Contentions ariſing, thoſe called Puritanes, moſtly were againſt that ſide which they ſaw the Biſhops and their Neighbour Enemies for: And they were for the Parliament the rather, becauſe they ſeemed deſirous to Reform the Biſhops, and Reſtore the Liberty of thoſe whom they proſecuted for the manner of their ſerving God. Yet they deſired, where-ever I was, to have lived peaceably at home: But the Drunkards and Rabble that formerly hated them, when they ſaw the War beginning, grew inraged; and if a man did but Pray, and Sing a Pſalm in his houſe, they would cry [*Down with the Roundheads*] (a word then new made for them,) and put them in fear of ſudden violence, and afterwards brought the King's Souldiers to plunder them of their goods, and they were fain to run into holes to hide their perſons (*Martin Cruſius* in his *Turco-Gracia* deſcribeth much the like Caſe of his Father.) And when their Goods were gone, and their Lives in continual danger, they were forced to fly for Food and Shelter: To go among thoſe that hated them, they durſt not, when they could not dwell among ſuch at home. And thus thouſands run into the Parliaments Garriſons, and having nothing there to live upon, became Souldiers.

We

We had an honeſt very Old *Arminian* (Mr. *Nayler*) in *Coventry*, that was againſt the Parliaments Cauſe; and he would ſay, [*The King hath the beſt Cauſe, and the Parliament the beſt Men.*] And that he wondred how it came to paſs, that the generality of ſober Religious men, ſhould be all in the wrong, and the moſt Irreligious and Prophane, and Debauched be in the right.] But he knew but the Vulgar, and not the Grandees, who no doubt were many of them men of very laudable accompliſhments.

And as the feud of the Biſhops and their Officers and Curates againſt the aforeſaid exerciſes of Religion occaſioned this ſad Diviſion, ſo did the ſenſe of this in the minds of thoſe called Puritanes continue too long. Many a time have I ſeen abundance in great Perplexity, ſaying [We believed them that profeſſed that they took not Arms againſt the King, but to execute the Law on Delinquents and defend themſelves and the Kingdom from them: We abhor the Regicides and Uſurpers: We would reſtore the King, if we were ſtronger than the Army. And yet we are in doubt how far we ſhould actively contribute to our own calamity: For though the King deſerve more than we can do, we doubt not but the Biſhops will increaſe our Burdens and make greater havock in the Church than heretofore] And many ſate ſtill on this account, and as far as ever I could diſcern, next the Power of the Army, the fear of the Biſhops was the chief delay of the Kings return.

I knew not all *England*; but according to the Extent of my acquaintance, I have truly told you the quality of thoſe then called Puritans and of their Common adverſaries.

And on which ſide now proportionably are moſt of the moſt underſtanding, ſober, charitable, conſcionable, and ſeriouſly religious Perſons, and on which moſt of the contrary (not ſpeaking of any Magiſtrates) I think it neither my work, nor our New Hiſtorians to tell: For people that live among their neighbours, will believe their ſenſes and experience, what ever either he or I ſhall ſay. And I am well aſſured that this argument (which I think was not found) [*We cannot believe that God will ſuffer the Generality of the Religious to be deceived in ſo great a caſe, and the moſt of the debauched ignorant haters of ſerious Godlineſs to be in the right,*] did prevail with very many that could not try the Cauſe by the Laws and conſtitution of the Kingdom.

§ 2. If I ſhould recite the particular unjuſt reports of multitudes

titudes of these Writers it would be tiresome and loathsome: Yea all the mistakes of this Eminent Historian are too many to be named: But I will here name one which seems at once to smite and smile.

Pag. 227. [" *There is a temper which Mr.* B. *is acquainted* " *with that, is not to be prevailed on, either by threats or promises* " *from the Magistrate; and seems to hate nothing so much as compli-* " *ance with Superiors: There are some that scorn to preach by the* " *Licence of the Government, and place the Kingdom of Christ purely* " *in opposition to Law and Magistrates.*]

Answ. Note the credibility of this Historian. 1. Doth their accusation of my flattering the Usurpers (whom I more openly disowned than most of his Fraternity) agree with this?

2. Did my long and earnest Petitioning to be accepted but in a poor Curates place, though I Preacht for nothing, yea if it were but in some ignorant obscure Village, and only to preach over the Catechism, agree with this?

3. Doth my large profession of Subjection in my Second Plea for Peace not yet blamed by them herein agree with this?

4. I willingly took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and an Oath to be true to the King as his Chaplain in ordinary, and had this any such signification?

5. Did my begging in vain a License from Bishop *Morley*, and craving and obtaining one of Bishop *Sheldon*, signifie this?

6. But the smile is that one would think by these words, I might have preached by the Governours License and would not. And is that true? Did I not preach by the Kings License, and the Clergy blame me for it? And as for the Bishops License I do profess that it's yet in force, and I do preach by it. If I mistake it is not my refusing it. If he intimate as he seems, that by the Bishops License I might have had leave to preach in the Parish Churches, it's now too late: But I would I had known how to get it. I confess one Summer in the Countrey about 25 miles off, I did venture upon the Credit of my License (at *Amersham*, *Chesham*, *Rickmersworth*, &c.) But it was too pleasing work to me to be continued: One Church in *Southwark* I was once let into, but no more in or near *London*. I once craved leave of the moderate Bishop that now is, that without putting down the meeting where I was in that great Parish of St. *Martin's*, I might preach sometime there and once a day at the Chappel

which

which I built, which the Pariſh Incumbent uſeth, and that he would quiet the Juſtices to that end, and thought I had had his conſent: But the Conſtables and other Officers ſtood from that day about a quarter of a year together every Lord's Day at the door of the former place of Aſſembly, to have apprehended me by the Juſtices warrant if I had gone. And never could I hear of a man in *London* that was willing I ſhould come into his Pulpit; but the beſt have refuſed it. Nor did I much deſire it here: For it is not to preach to them that have no need that is my requeſt; but to ſuch as cannot come into the Pariſh Church or otherwiſe truely need our help. Once I did try to have got leave two miles out of the City to have preacht a Kinſwomans Funerall Sermon on the right of my Licenſe: But the Miniſter ſaid, He muſt firſt ask the Biſhop, and then denyed me.

Reader, theſe are the Hiſtorians that Charge me with miſreport of ancient Hiſtory, viſible in the moſt partial Authors on the other ſide: Judge of them by their Report of the Hiſtory of our Place and Age.

CHAP. XV.

Mr. M's. *way of getting belief, by a Magiſterial condemning the moſt credible Hiſtorians, and authorizing whom he pleaſe.*

§ 1. IF we had not *Euſebius*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, how naked ſhould we be left, and much unacquainted with the caſe of the Church from the Apoſtles; (Beſides *Theodorets* Hiſtory) till 440. And what a ſhake is given to the Credit of all theſe by Mr. *M.* and others of greater name?

Though *Euſebius* himſelf be by *Petavius* and many other Papiſts accounted an *Arian*, yea and ſeemingly proved ſuch, and by *Bellarmine de Script. Eccleſ.* its ſaid that *Athanaſius* ſo calls him, and *Jerom* calls him the *Arian* Signifer and Prince, and the 7th General Council ſo judgeth him, yet *Socrates* vindicateth him, and thinks he is wronged: And indeed though his own Epiſtle written to his Flock be not juſtifyable, incautelous and unjuſtifyable words were too Common before his daies (as *Petavius* hath too fully proved) with thoſe that we muſt not yet call *Arians*. But while *Bellarmine* and Mr. *M.* charge *Socrates* and

Sozomen

Sozomen as *Novatians* that is Hereticks themſelves, they deprive *Euſebius* of much of their defence; and render his Hiſtory the more ſuſpicious.

§ 2. And though I know Mr. *M.* hath more partners herein, I never ſaw yet any credible proof that either of them were *Novatians*: Good Chriſtians are not aſhamed nor afraid to make profeſſion of their Religion. And they are ſo far from profeſſing it, that they oft ſpeak of the *Novatians* in diſowning words. But they praiſed them for the good that is in them! And would not any impartial Hiſtorian do the like? Muſt a man rail at any party, or hide their Virtues or elſe be taken to be one of them? I confeſs that ſuch as Mr. *M.* do fully acquit themſelves from the ſuſpicion of being Presbyterians or Nonconformiſts. But ſo did not A. Biſhop *Grindall*, Biſhop *Jewel*, A. Biſhop *Abbot* A. Biſhop *Uſher*, and many more ſuch. Sure Candor and Impartiality is Laudable in Hiſtorians; And *Thuanus* is moſt honoured for that. And notwithſtanding Mr. *M's* aſſertions of the contrary, I profeſs my ſelf a lover & honourer of the worth of many of the aſpiring Biſhops that corrupted the Church, and of many Popes, and of many that continue Church corruptions in the height; even many of the Papiſts Cardinals, Schoolmen and Jeſuites. Who will not love and praiſe the excellent Learning of ſuch as *Suarez*, *Vaſquez*, *Victoria*, *Petavius* and abundance ſuch? Who will not praiſe the piety of ſuch as *Gerſon*, *Borromaus*, *Sales*, and many others, though we nevertheleſs diſown their Popery? For my part I highly value the Clearneſs, of multitudes of the Schoolmen, and that they have not in whole loads of their volumes ſo much malicious railing as the Jeſuits and many of our late Conformiſts have in a few ſheets. Doth it follow that I am a Papiſt becauſe I praiſe them, or that *Socrates* or *Sozomen* were *Novatians* becauſe they ſpeak well of their faith and piety.

There are abundance of Malignants, that acknowledge the Good Lives of thoſe they call Puritanes (and if he had not had the late Wars between King and Parliament to fill all Mouths and Books againſt them, the Devil by this time might have been at a loſs with what Accuſations to reproach them. For he was put to uſe the *Voices* (no names) of [*Roundheads*, *Whigs*, &c. when their Revilers were called Drunkards. Swearers, Dam-me's, *&c.*] But they that confeſs the Good, reproach them as Hypocrites that do but counterfeit it. Doth this ac-

knowledgment prove them Puritanes. I ſuppoſe Mr. *M.* knoweth that no ſmall number of Hiſtorians and Fathers confeſs the ſtrictneſs of the *Novatians* Lives, and yet were no *Novatians*. And *Conſtantine*'s words to *Aceſius* imply that he thought him ſingularly ſtrict. And Mr. *M.* ſaith Pref. [*The* Novatians, *ſaith the Author, did not ſuffer much by this Edict, being befriended by the Emperour, who had an eſteem for their Biſhop of* C. P. *upon the account of his Holineſs.*] And may not an Orthodox man confeſs the Piety of others?

§ 3. But Mr. *M.* is ſo Magiſterial as to ſay, *Pag.* 322. *The ſtory of* Theophilus, *and the Monks of* Nitria, *no reaſonable man can believe, as it is related by* Socrates *and* Sozomen, *without loving a malicious Lie.*] So that *Socrates* and *Sozomen* either believed not themſelves, or elſe *Loved a malicious Lie.*

And *Page* 319. he ſaith, [*The ſtory of* Theophilus *his charging* Iſidore *with double Letters, that whoever was Conquerour, he might apply himſelf to him in his name, is of the ſame piece with the reſt of* Socrates *his ſtory concerning that Biſhop; and in all probability an invention of one of the Monks of* Nitria.]

It ſeems this Hiſtorian believeth Old Hiſtorians, as the matters ſeem probable or improbable to himſelf. And ſo we may take him for the Univerſal Expoſitor of Hiſtory: It is not the Old Hiſtorians that we muſt believe, but his Conjectures. And thus he deals with divers others.

§ 4. For my part I profeſs, that before I had any Engagement in theſe Controverſies, ſince I firſt read them, I took *Socrates* and *Sozomen* to be two of the moſt credible Hiſtorians that the Church had till their Times, and of many an Age after them. I ſaid of them, as I uſe to do of *Thuanus*, A man may trace the footſteps of Knowledge, and impartial honeſty, and ſo of Veracity in their very ſtyle. And there are few of the judicious Cenſurers of Hiſtorians, but do tell us of far more uncertainties in *Euſebius*, and after in *Nicephorus*, and moſt that followed, (as far as I am acquainted with ſuch Cenſurers) than in theſe two. And if their Hiſtory be ſhaken, our loſs will not be ſmall. And I doubt not but the Anathematizing and Condemning Spirit hath done hurt, which hath made *Euſebius* an undoubted *Arian*, and *Theodoret*, firſt a *Neſtorian*, and after at the fifth General Council condemned ſome of his Writings, and impoſed it on the whole Chriſtian World to condemn them, though many never heard of them

them, and that made *Ruffinus* (and *Chryſoſtom*) *Originiſts*, and *Origen* a Heretick, condemned alſo by a General Council, and *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*, *Novatians*, *Epiphanius* an ignorant credulous Fabler, *Sulpitius Severus*, and *Beda*, two pious credulous Reporters of many feigned Miracles, and one a *Millenary*, *Nicephorus* a Fabler, *Anaſtaſius Bibl.* full of Falſhoods, *Philaſtrius* an ignorant Erroneous Hereticator, *Caſſianus* a *Semi-Pelagian*, *Caſſiodori Chronic. eſt ſarrago temulentiæ inquit Onuphrius Pan. Pene nunquam cum Euſebio convenit inquit Voſſius*, &c. I ſay, Though it be no wrong to the Church to take them for fallible, and ſuch as have miſtakes (which the *Engliſh* Articles ſay even of General Councils) yet it wrongfully ſhaketh all our belief of Church Hiſtory to call their Credit in matters of fact into queſtion for their Errours or opinions ſake, without good Evidence that either they were ignorant, miſ-informed or wilfully lied. But if the *Novatians* were more ſtrict & preciſe than others, it's rather like that they were more and not leſs credible than others, and made more or not leſs conſcience of a lye. Certainly that which the reſt named are charged with is ſomewhat more as to Hiſtorical Credit than to be *Novatians*: So that if theſe men had been *Novatians*, I ſhould yet ſay by the Complexion of their Hiſtory that They are two of our moſt uſeful and credible Church Hiſtorians.

§ 5. But when it ſerveth his turn he can gather out of *Sozomen* that even in *Conſtantine*'s time, *Conſtantinople* was [*Altogether a Chriſtian City*] Becauſe he mentioneth the great Enlargement of it; and great encreaſe of Chriſtianity: When as no man that lived could be a fitter judge of the number of Chriſtians in his time than *Chryſoſtom*: And he that conſidered that there and every where *Conſtantine* left all the Jews and Heathens uncompelled to be Chriſtians, yea and uſed them commonly in places of dignity and Government in City, Provinces and Armies, and that they continued in ſuch power under many Emperours after him, will hardly believe that in *Conſtantine*'s time *C. P.* had half or a quarter ſo many Chriſtians as were in the time of *Arcadius* and *Chryſoſtom*; And yet then *Chryſoſtom* conjectureth the Chriſtians to be an hundred thouſand, and all the City poor half as many, but the Jews and Heathens not to be numbred. See him one *Act* 4. *Hom.* 11. When he is making the moſt of their eſtate and numbers, ſaith he [*I pray you tell me: How great a number of all ſorts of men hath our City? How many Chriſtians*

will you that there be (That is will you grant, or do you think there be ?) *Will you that there be* δέκα μυριάδας, *an hundred thouſand ? But how great is the Number of Jews and Ethnicks ? How many pounds of Gold have been gathered ?* (or Myriads ?) *And how great is the Number of the Poor ?* (that is, of the whole City ?) *I do not think they are above fifty thouſand* (*Commelin.* hath put an hundred thouſand, as *Eraſmus* Tranſlation, I ſuppoſe by the Errour of the Preſs.) Now if there was in *Chryſoſtom*'s daies but an hundred thouſand (which many ſay is not near ſo many as there be in two Pariſhes here, *Martins* and *Stepney*) it is not like that in *Conſtantine*'s Time they were half ſo many at moſt. And yet I am far from thinking that there was then no more than uſually met in an Aſſembly, or could ſo meet.

§ 6. The Jeſuites, *Valeſius* and *Sirmondus*, I am no fit perſon to cenſure. But I am not ſatisfied why their Credit ſhould go as far with me as it doth with him: I have before ſpoke of *Valeſius*'s Recording *Grotius* as one that deſigned to bring many with him into the *Roman* Church. And *Grotius* himſelf ſaith, That many of the *Engliſh* Biſhops were of his mind, as Biſhop *Bromhall*, and many Doctors by defending him ſeem to be: And yet when I wrote my *Chriſtian Concord*, and *The Grotian Religion*, how many cenſured me as a Slanderer, for ſaying leſs than *Valeſius* doth. Yet I am falſe with this Hiſtorian, and *Valeſius* is a credible Jeſuite.

And he vouchſafeth to tell us the Judgment of *Valeſius*, that *Euſebius Nicomed.* was no *Arian*, pag. 332. where he ſaith [Euſebius *of* Nicomedia *was no Heretick in the Judgment of* Valeſius: *But if he were, he was not an Heretick, becauſe he did not begin the Arch-Hereſie, but followed* Arius.]

What the meaning is of the latter words I know not [*If he were* (an Heretick) *he was not an Heretick*] I conjecture it is one of the *almoſt Infinite Errata's* of the Printer: (But he ſuppoſeth my Printer's to be mine own:) But that *Euſebius Nicomed.* ſhould be no Heretick, whom all the ſtream of credible Hiſtorians make to be that Arch-Heretick (I ſay not the firſt) who corrupted *Conſtantine* his Court and Son, which introduced the prevalency of *Arianiſm* to the almoſt Ruine of the Orthodox Church, is a thing which he that believeth *Valeſius* in, muſt prefer the Credit of one Jeſuite that lived above a thouſand years after, before the whole current of the beſt Hiſtorians of the ſame,

ſame, and many following Ages. And did I ever ſo diſcredit the whole ſtream of Church-Hiſtorians, as on the word of one Jeſuite, to bring them under the ſuſpicion of ſuch a Lie? But I confeſs I am more inclined to believe a Jeſuite, and a Prelatiſt, when they excuſe any man of Hereſie, than when they accuſe him.

§ 7. In the Preface he tells us that["*Had I conſulted* Sirmond's, "*Edition of the* French *Councils I muſt have wanted ſeveral Alle-*"*gations for the Congregational way, which are nothing elſe but corrupt* "*readings of the ancient Canons of the* Gallican *Church. Nor can we* "*ſuſpect* Sirmond *as too great a favourer of Dioceſan Biſhops, ſince it* "*is well known how he is charged by the Abbot of S.* Cyran *under the* "*name of* Petrus Aurelius, *for having falſified a Canon in the Council* "*of* Orange *to the prejudice of the Epiſcopal Order*] *Jeſuites care* "*as little for Biſhops as our Proteſtant Diſſenters can do.*] *Anſw.* I doubt not but *Sirmond* was a very Learned man, and had not the Conformiſts diveſted me of all Church-maintenance, I had been like to have bought his *French* Councils. In the mean time, that notice which others before him gave of the Acts and Canons of Councils, ſufficed to my furniture, fully to prove the Cauſe I maintained: But I confeſs his pretended reaſon no whit induceth me to give more credit to a Jeſuite than to another man. Though *Albaſpineus* was a Biſhop, there is ſo much Judgment and Honeſty appears in his Obſervations, that I would ſooner believe him about Epiſcopacy, than a Jeſuite that you ſay is againſt it.

But it's as incredible to me, as the reſt of his ſpurious Hiſtory, that the *Jeſuites care as little for Biſhops as our Proteſtant Diſſenters can do.* Sure many of thoſe called Presbyterians and Independents, would have none at all. If this be true, then 1. The Jeſuites would have no Biſhops of *Rome*, though they be his ſworn Servants. 2. Then they would have no Biſhops to be ſubject to the Pope. 3. Then they would have all particular Churches to be without Biſhops, or to be unchurcht. 4. Then they would have Ordination without Biſhops. 5. Then they think not that an uninterrupted Succeſſion of Epiſcopal Ordination is neceſſary to Church or Miniſtry. 6. Then they think that Biſhops ſhould not confirm. 7. Then they are againſt the Councils of Biſhops, General or Provincial. 8. And againſt Dioceſans Government of the Pariſh Prieſts. And yet is a Jeſuite a Papiſt? Wonderful!

Wonderful! that they will venture their Lives in endeavours for the Church of *Rome*, and that they write so much of and for Bishops Councils, and yet are quite against them.

But if really this be so, you that take me for incredible, who am against but the Corruption of Episcopacy, do allow me to take *Sirmondus* and *Valesius*, and the rest of the Jesuites for incredible, who are as much against the very Office as our Dissenters can be? But what will not some Historians confidently say?

CHAP. XVI.

Mr. M's. *Observations on my Notes of credible and incredible History, Examined.*

§ 1. I. BEcause I suppose that common sound Senses are to be trusted: He 1. Infers that I was asleep, & thought that I saw all that I relate; that is, He that saith he must believe sense, implies that he seeth all that he reporteth: I am one of the unlearned, and this Logick is too hard for me: Let it be his own.

2. He concludes, *That we must not believe our senses, if they were not Presbyterians but Episcopal that begun the late War* (in *England*:) As if he had seen not only the Parliament (Lords and Commons) then, and the Army then (forty years ago almost) but had seen their Religion, or heard or read them then so profess it: Whereas I cannot learn yet whether he was then born, or of capable understanding, and hath neither sense nor reason for what he saith. The Case that we are in is very sad, when both sides say they have the Evidence of Sense it self against each other; what hope then of Reconciliation? They that are yet living, that were Lords, Commons, and Commanders, say their internal Sense and Self-knowledge told them that they were no Presbyterians, but Episcopal; and their daily converse told them, that their Companions were mostly of the same Religion and Mind. But Young Men that never conversed with them, know them all better, and that infallibly by sense it self.

§ 2.

§ 2. II. Becauſe I ſay, the Hiſtory of the Goſpel is certainly credible; it is ground enough to ſay, That *All is not Goſpel that I write*; as if I had ſaid it is.

§ 3. III. Becauſe I ſay, *Prophets were ſure of their Revelation*, he ſaith. *It may be Mr. B. heard a Bene ſcripſiſti*: As if I had pretended to be a Prophet.

§ 4. IV. I ſaid that Hiſtory is certain even by Natural Evidence, when it is the common Agreement of all men of moſt contrary Intereſts, *&c.* in a matter of fact and ſenſe to all that knew it. To which he ſaith [*The Superiority of Biſhops over Presbyters is acknowledged by Catholicks, and Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, men of very contrary minds, diſpoſitions and intereſts; and yet this Church-Hiſtory would have us believe the contrary.*

Anſw. This is our credible Hiſtorian.

1. He doth not tell us in what Ages it was ſo acknowledged; when thoſe who doubt of the matter of fact, doubt but ſome of 100, ſome of 150, or 200 years: Doth any doubt whether it be ſo now?

2. He tells us not either what Species of Biſhops the queſtion is of, nor what Species of Presbyters, nor what the Superiority was.

3. He ſpeaks without diſtinction or Exception, and ſo muſt be underſtood to ſay that *this Church hiſtory would have us to believe that even Preſident Biſhops* Ejuſdem Ordinis *had* de facto *no Superiority at all over Presbyters in the ſame Churches and of the ſame order with them*, which is an untruth ſo groſs as is no Credit to our Hiſtorian. I have named both more than one ranck of Biſhops whoſe Superiority *de jure* I deny not: & Popes, Patriarchs, Primates, Dioceſans who depoſed the Biſhops of ſingle Churches, whoſe Superiority *de facto* I fully enough affirm, in the ages and degrees in which they did aſcend.

If he ſay that he meant it [*Even from the Apoſtles time, and that of ſuch Dioceſans as have ſcores or hundreds of true Churches and Altars without their particular Biſhops, or any Presbyters that were* Ejuſdem Ordinis *with the Biſhops, and were* Epiſcopi Gregis, *and that had ſuch Power of the Keys over their flocks, as ours have not: or that had ſo many ſuch Aſſemblies that were no true Churches;*] if he will be proved a Hiſtorian worthy Credit, Let him give us any proof that all men deſcribed by him agreed *de facto* that there was ſo long, ſuch a ſuperiority of ſuch Biſhops. But theſe men

men deride distinguishing, and banish Logick, that is Reason, from their History.

§ 5. V. The next Evidence of certainty which I mentioned, was from [*continued Existent visible Effects which prove their Causes.*] And here this undistinguishing Historian is at it again. *The Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is proved by the Laws and Customs of all Churches.* This hath the same answer, which I will not repeat. Either it falsly reporteth my denyal, or it falsly affirmeth that all Churches in all ages have left us visible Effects of the foresaid species. And I would he would help us that are ignorant therein with such History and Evidence from the begining of the Churches in *Scotland*, and in the Southern and Eastern Countreis that were without the Empire.

§ 6. VI. I said, that History is credible which speaketh consentingly against the known intereſt of the authors: and therefore I named few testimonies of the sins of Popes and Councils but of those that are their most Zealous Friends. To this he saith that my Characters of ancient Bishops are taken from their professed Enemies, [as my account of *Athanasius*, *Theophylus*, *Cyril*, and divers others.]

Ans. 1. My account of *Athanasius* is almost all, if not all, in his praise, and is not an enemies testimony there valid. If I mention the displeasure of *Constantine* against him it is not any Character of him, but of *Constantine* the Agent: Nor do I think *Constantine*, or *Eusebius Cæsar*: meet to be numbred with his Enemies; why did he not instance in some words of mine?

As to *Theophylus* and *Cyril*, I do not believe that he can prove that *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, and the Historians that Concur with them, were their Enemies. And if in reciting the Acts of the Councils I recite their Enemies words, so doth *Surius*, *Nicholinus*, *Binnius*, *Baronius* and all just writers of those acts. And I do not find that *Chrysostom* himself, or *Isidore Pelusiota* had any Enmity to them, nor Pope Innocent neither. Of the rest before.

§ 7. VII. The next degree of credibility that I mentioned is that which dependeth on the Veracity and fitness of the reporter. Of which I named nine things requisite.

Here he supposeth me one that is unfit; and particluarly saith [*Whether any hath railed with greater intemperance, and less provocation*] *Ans.* 1. I am not the Author of the History of the mentioned Councils or Popes or Bishops, but the Transcriber. Let me

me be as bad as you, or any of your tribe have made me, that proveth not that *Socrates, Sozomen, Theodorite, Nitephorus, &c.* or *Binnius, Baronius, &c.* have misreported what they write. If I have misreported these authors in any material point, prove it and I will soon retract it.

As for my railing, I expect that title from all such whose faults I name, and call them to repentance: He that calls men to *Repent*, calleth them sinners, and that is Railing be it never so great.

His first instanced railing is Pag. 19. [*A few turbulent Prelates Persecute good men*] He saith thus I call the present Bishops of the Church of *England*; Doth he mean *All or some?* If *All* he is an untrue Historian: He may see many named before my Apology whom I except: And if I have named two I have annexed the proof.

The next is Pag. 46. [*silencing destroying Prelates*] *Ans.* Are there none such? Were not about 2000 here silenced? Do we not continue so and impoverished almost 20 years? Have none perished in prisons or with want? Do men call out for the execution of the Law, and plead for our Silencing as a good work, and take it for railing to have it named? Doth not Conscience recoil in these men when in Pulpits, press and Conference they maintain it to be a good work, and tell the world how sinful a thing it is for rulers to suffer us out of Gaols? What, are you now ashamed of your meritorious works? Sure they are scant good if it be railing to name them. You will not say I rail, if I call you Preachers. And why do you say so, if I call you *Silencers*, if that be as good?

The next railing is Pag. 73 [*If all the proud, Contentious, ambitious, hereticating part of the Bishops, had been of this Christian mind* (to endure each other in small tollerable Differences) *What sins, Scandal and shame, what Crimes, confusion and miseries had the Christian world escaped?*] And is this railing? Hath the Christian world had no such Bishops these 1000 years? Have not whole Kingdoms been forbidden all Gods Publick worship by such, even *France* and *England* among the rest? Is it railing to tell for what little things they not only Silenced men, but burned and murdered many thousands? Were they not proud ambitious Prelates that deposed and abused *Lud. Pius*, and those that in Council decreed the digging all the dead Bishops out of their graves to be burnt as Hereticks, who were for the Em-

perours power of Inveſtitures? Do I rail if I ſay that *Greg.*7. was Proud and ambitious when he threatened the Prince of *Calais* with the loſs of his dominions, unleſs he made his Biſhop ſhave his beard? Do not *Jewel*, and all Proteſtant writers ſay worſe than this of Papiſt Biſhops? Is there any ſuch thing as pride ſilencing, burning, &c. If yea, muſt it never be known, reproved, repented of and ſo forgiven to the penitent? And if yea, than how ſhall it be known without proper names? By what name ſhould I have called *Silencing* but its own and ſo of the reſt? Gods power over Conſcience is marvellous that ſin cannot endure its own name.

The next railing is the word [*Hereticating.*] And how could I have known if he had not told me that this word is railing? Did not the Biſhops take it for a great ſervice of God, and is it railing to name it? It's true I uſed one word inſtead of a Sentence for brevity, to ſignifie the Biſhops culpable over doing in proclaiming m n Hereticks. He that doth not believe that they did not well, nor do not to this day in Cutting off from the Church of Chriſt all thoſe whole Countreys of Chriſtians called *Neſtorians, Jacobites, Melchites* and the *Monothelites* and many ſuch I cannot ſave him from himſelf who will own all ſuch ſin and contract the guilt of it. Hath not Biſhop *Epiphanius* made us more Hereticks than he needed? Hath not Biſhop *Philaſtrius* made many more than the Devil himſelf made? Leſt this paſs for railing once more I will name ſome of them.

1. *His* 11*th ſort of Hereticks are thoſe that kept* Eaſter-day *at a wrong time* (*as our* Brittains *and* Scots *did.*

2. *The* Millenaries *are the* 12*th* (*ſuch as many of the antient fathers, and our Mr.* Mede, *Dr.* Twiſs, *&c.*)

3. *The* 27*th Offered Bread and Cheeſe at the oblation.*

4. *The* 28*th put New Wine in New Veſſels in the Church.*

5. *The* 29*th Put their fingers on their mouths for Silence.*

6. *The* 30*th thought that all Prophets ended not with Chriſt.*

7. *The* 33*d went without ſhooes.*

8. *The* Novatians *are the* 34*th.*

9. *The* 41*th thought the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not written by* Paul, *but by* Barnabas *or* Clemens? *and the Epiſtle to* Laodicea *by* Luke.

10. *The* 42*th are the Orthodox* Miletians *that Communicated with the Orthodox and ſome* Arians *too.*

11. *The*

11. *The* 46*th doubted of the diversity of Heavens.*

12. *The* 47*th being ignorant that there is another Common Earth invisible, which is the* Matrix *of all things, do think that there is no Earth but this one.*

13. *The* 48*th thought that water was the common matter, and was alwaies, and not made with the Earth.*

14. *The* 49*th Heresie denyed that the soul was made before the body, and the body after joyned to it: and believed that Gods making them Male and Female first was to be understood of the bodily Sexes: Whereas (saith he) it was the Soul that was made Male and Female, And the Soul was made the Sixth day and the body the* 7*th.*

15. *The* 50*th Heresie thought that not only Grace, but also the Soul itself, was by God breathed into man.*

6. *The* 51*st is* Origens *(that thought our Souls were first celestial Intellects, before incorporate (as Mr.* Glanvile *and many now.)*

17. *The* 52*d thought that brutes had some reason (as Mr.* Chambre.*)*

18. *The* 54*th thought that Earthquakes have a natural Cause.*

19. *The* 55*th Heresie learned of* Trismegistus *to call the Stars by the names of Living Creatures (as all Astronomers do.)*

20. *The* 56*th thought that there were not many languages before the confusion of* Babel.

21. *The* 57*th Heresie thought that the name of a* [Tongue] *proceeded first of the* Jews *or of the* Pagans.

22. *The* 58*th Heresie doubted of the years and time of Christ.*

23. *The* 59*th thought (as many Fathers) that Angels begat Giants of women before the flood.*

24. *The* 61*st was that Christians were after* Jews *and* Pagans.

25. *The* 62*d Heresie saith that* Pagans *are born naturally, but not Christians, that is, that the Soul and body of men are not daily Created by Christ, but by Nature.*

26. *The* 63*d saith that the number of years from the Creation was uncertain and unknown.*

27. *The* 64 *thought that the names of the daies of the week (*Sunday, Monday, &c.*) were made by God first and not by* Pagans, *and were named from the Planets.*

28. *The* 66*th was that* Adam *and* Eve *were blind till God opened their Eyes to see their nakedness.*

29. *The* 67*th Heresie imputeth the Sins of Parents to their Children.*

30. *The* 68 *Hereſie was of ſome troubled about the Book called* Deuteronomy.

31. *The* 69 *thought that thoſe ſanctified in the Womb were yet conceived in ſin.*

32. *The* 70th *Hereſie thought that the World had been firſt divided by the* Greeks, Egyptians, *and* Perſians.

33. *The* 71 *thought there was a former Flood under* Deucalion *and* Pyrrha.

34. *The* 72 *ſaith that men are according to (or under) the* 12 *ſigns of the Zodiack, not knowing that thoſe* 12 *ſigns are divers Climates, and habitable Regions of the Earth.*

35. *The* 74 *Hereſie is that Chriſt deſcended into Hell to offer Repentance there to ſinners.*

36. *The* 75 *doubted of the nature of the Soul, thinking it was made of Fire,* &c. (*as many* Greek *Fathers did.*)

37. *The* 77 *is of Gods hardening* Pharaoh, (*&c. where he deſcribeth the* Dominicans.)

38. *The* 79 *is that the Pſalms were not* (*all*) *made by* David: *and it denieth the equality of the Pſalms, as if they were not all written and placed in the order that the things were done.*

39. *The* 80 *Hereſie thought that Gods words to* Cain [Thou ſhalt rule over him] *were properly to be underſtood, whereas the meaning was* [Thou ſhalt rule over thy own evil Thoughts that are in thy own free Will.]

40. *The* 81 *Hereſie did not well underſtand the reaſon of Gods Words to* Cain, *giving him Life.*

41. *The* 82 *Hereſie thought that the Stars had their fixed place in Heaven, and their courſe, not underſtanding that the Stars are every night brought out of ſome ſecret place, and ſet up for uſe, and at morning return to their ſecret place again, Angels being Preſidents and Diſpoſers of them,* (*that is, as ſervants bring Candles into the room at night and take them out again.*)

42. *The* 83 *doubted* (*as ſome Epiſcopal Commentators*) *of the Book of* Canticles, *leſt it had a carnal Senſe.*

43. *The* 85 *Hereſie thought, that the Soul of man was naturally Gods Image before Grace.*

44. *The* 87 *Hereſie thought, that really four living Creatures mentioned in the Prophets praiſed God.*

45. *The* 88 *Hereſie thought that the Levitical Feaſts were litterally to be underſtood, not knowing that it was the* 8 *Feaſts of the Church that were meant.*

46. *The*

46. *The* 90 *Hereſie preferred* Aquila's *Tranſlation before the Septuagint.*

47. *The* 91 *preferred a Tranſlation of thirty men before the Septuagint.*

48. *The* 92 *preferred another Tranſlation of ſix men before it.*

49. *Another Hereſie preferred the Tranſlation of* Theodotion *and* Symmachus *before it.*

50. *The* 94 *Hereſie preferred the Scriptures found in a Veſſel after the Captivity before it.*

51. *The* 96*th ought that* Melchizedeck *had no Father or Mother, not knowing that it's ſpoken of him as learning that which his Father and Mother never taught him.*

52. *The* 97 *hold that the Prophet* Zachariah *of Faſts, is to be properly underſtood; when as it is but for the four Faſts of the Church,* viz. *for* Chriſtmas, Eaſter, Epiphany, *and* Pentecoſt.

53. *The* 98 *Hereſie holdeth, that* Solomon's *great number of Wives and Concubines, is literally to be underſtood; whereas it is meant but of diverſity of Gifts in the Church.*

54. *The* 100 *Hereſie thought that the Meaſuring Cord in* Zachary, *was to be underſtood of meaſuring* Jeruſalem *literally whereas it meant the choice of Believers.*

55. *The* 101 *Hereſie not underſtanding the Myſtical Senſe of the* Cherubim *and* Seraphim, *in* Iſaiah, *are troubled about it, and in doubt (And here he Myſtically tells you the Myſtical Senſe.)*

56. *The laſt Hereſie thought that one of the* Cherubims *came to* Iſaiah, *and with a Coal touched his Lips, and that it was an Angel or Animal with Fire; whereas it is the Two Teſtaments, and the Fire of God's Grace.*

To theſe you may add if you pleaſe the Hereſie of holding Antipodes, determined by Pope Zachary, *by the Mediation of the holy Biſhop* Boniface, *I think an* Engliſh *man. And of what peril it is for Chriſtians to eat Jayes, and Rooks, and Badgers, and Hares, and Wood horſes: And Lard muſt not be eaten before it is dryed in the Smoak, or boiled on the Fire: Or if it be eaten unboiled, it muſt not be till after* Eaſter: *And there muſt be three great Lamps ſet in a ſecret place of the Church, after the ſimilitude of the Tabernacle, which muſt be kept burning; and at Baptiſm others lighted by them.*

Reader, remember 1. That *Philaſtrius* as well as *Epiphanius*, was a Biſhop; 2. Yea and a Saint; whereas very few Biſhops

of

of all the Councils had the honour to be Sainted.

Therefore if you say that all these were not Anathematized by Councils; I answer, 1. All these are Registred as Hereticks. 2. And they held (as Mr. *Dodwell* and his Company here do) that he that communicateth with Hereticks, is to be judged a Heretick. 3. And that Hereticks are no parts of the Church.

And forget not above all the *Herodician* Heresie, which determineth not only our King, but many Papist Princes to be Hereticks, for claiming Investitures.

And now Reader, I unfeignedly hate uncharitableness, and therefore deny no good that was in such Bishops: But I must no more be indifferent between Good and Evil, than between Heaven and Hell; nor may I judge Christ a Railer, for saying to his prime Apostle, [*Get thee behind me Satan, thou art an offence unto me*,&c.] If the name of [*Hereticators*] that is,too rash pronouncing men Hereticks be railing,I will give thee no Character, censure or name of the aforesaid practice,for I can devise no name which may not be called *Railing*. But judge of it and call it what you see cause.

And again, if you say, These are not the Decrees of Councils, I answer, These are but Flea-bitings to the wounds that the Church hath received from Councils, by Anathematizing.

The next Instance of Railing in these words, which he half repeateth [*Either credible* Socrates *and others were gross Lyars, or this Patriarch and St was a downright Knave.*] *Ans.* He himself is so far from denying this, that he makes *Socrates* and *Sozomen* not only Lyars, but Lovers of a Lie; for what they say of St. *Theophilus:* And who is it then that is the Railer? Read the Story.

The next Instance is, *p.*95. that I call Bishops the [*Firebrands of the World*] *Ans.* The words are these [*I take them to be the Firebrands of the World, and unworthy the regard of sober men, who pretend to know mens judgments better than themselves, and allow not mens own deliberate professions to be the notice of their Faith.*] If they will say, that you are Hereticks in heart, though your Tongue and Life profess sound Doctrine, what means hath any man to clear himself against such, and keep from their Inquisition Racks or Flames? Is this Railing?

The next Instance is the Word [*Self-conceited Bishops*] P. 98. Having mentioned the many Logical Niceties necessary to de-

cide

cide the Question between the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, and the Orthodox, I said [*Is it not pity that such Questions should be raised about the Person of Christ, by self conceited Bishops, and made necessary to Salvation, and the World set on fire and divided by them?*] Reader, remember the Division made by it continueth to this day, to the Separation and Condemnation of a great part of the Christian World! And is the name [*self-conceited*] in describing the cause of this a railing? How much worse railers are they that will call a Drunkard a Drunkard, or a Fornicator a Fornicator? Read the sadder words of *Ludolphus*.

The next *railing* is [*merciless, furious Bishops*, pag. 196] *Ans.* There is no such word: When I find where it is I shall see the occasion of it. *Italy*, *Piedmont*, *Ireland*, &c. have tried that there have been such.

The last is pag. 183. [*The Confounders of Churches.*] *Ans.* I thought I had merited of them by my impartiality and lenity: As after I commend the Wisdom & peaceableness of Pope *Honorius*, (though a General Council even for that made him an Heretick,) so I here justly commend the Wisdom and Peaceableness of Pope *Vigilius*, who advised the Council to *leave dead men to God* (*Theod. Mopsv. Theodorite* and *Ibis*] *and not damn them when God hath judged them already, and yet not to admit any of their wrong opinions*] I say [*This was the right way: If they had all dealt as wisely and Christianlike, Councils had not been the Confounders of the Churches*] Is this railing? At last they forced Pope *Vigilius* to subscribe to them, and it so confounded the Churches, that a great part of *Italy* itself forsook the Church of *Rome* for it, and set up another head against the Pope an 100 Years. Was not this confusion? And must it not be known?

Reader, as far as I understand them, the Paraphrase of these mens words, is [If we kindle a fire in the Church, name it not, much less call any to quench it: or else we'll say it's you that kindle it: say not you are excommunicate or silenced when you are, though it be by Thousands: else we will prove that you are railers: If we lay you in Gaols and take all you have, do not say, *you hurt us*, much less you wrong us: take not on you to know or feel when you are hurt: else we will have an Action of railing against you.

§ 8. That which followeth I answered before: But after he finds a notable piece of my ignorance. The Pope inviting the

King

King of *Denmark* to conquer a Province of Hereticks, I know not who they were unleſs they were the *Waldenſes*: *Well gueſt*, ſaith Mr. *M. Waldo* was in 1160, 80 Years after. *Anſ.* This will ſerve for men willing to be deceived. It was the *Perſons* and *Religion*, and not the name that I ſpoke of. Doth not he know that *Rainerius* himſelf ſaith, that thoſe Perſons (called *Albigenſes*, *Waldenſes*, and other ſuch names) profeſſed that their way of Religion was Apoſtolical, and they derived it down from *Silveſters*, that is *Conſtantines* time? If I did not gueſs well I wrong no Biſhops by it: and I confeſſed my Ignorance that I knew not whom the Pope meant: And why did not this callent Hiſtorian tell us who they were?

§ 9. Next he hath met with my Ignorance for ſaying *Vienna near France*] which is in the Borders of *France*. *Anſ* 1. Is that any ſlander of Biſhops or Councils? 2 Truly I had many a time read in Councils, that *Vienna* was in *France*, and had not forgot it, if *Ferrarius* and *Chenu* had not alſo told it me; And whether it was the fault of the *Printer*, or of my *Hand*, or my *Memory*, that put *near* for *in*, I leave it freely to his Judgment, for I remember it not.

And if the manner of *Binnius* naming it made me call *Ordo Prophetarum* in *Gelaſius* a Book, it's no wrong to Epiſcopacy.

CHAP. XVII.

His Cenſure of my Deſign, and Church-Principles, conſidered.

§ 1. AS to this his firſt Chapter I have before ſhewed how falſly he reporteth my deſign. He ſaith he *never ſaw any thing which more reflecteth on Religion: Lucian* and *Julian have left nothing half ſo ſcandalous in all their Libels againſt Chriſtians, as this Church-Hiſtory has raked up: Here is nothing to be ſeen in his Book but the Avarice, Ignorance, Miſtakes and furious Contentions of the Governours of the Church.*

Anſ. How falſe that is the Reader may ſee in all the beginning, the two Chapters in the end, and much in the midſt, which are written contrarily to obviate ſuch falſe thoughts 2. Is the aſcendent ſort of Prelates that were growing up to maturity till *Gregory*

Gregory the Seventh's daies, the whole Church of God? Are there no other Christians? Is all that is written against the Pope and such Ascendents, written against Christianity? Did Christ speak against Christianity, when he reproved them for striving who should be greatest? or *Peter*, when he counselled them, as 1 *Pet.* 5. And *Paul* when he said, *I have no man like minded; for they all seek their own things, and not the things that are Jesus Christ's?* Or when he said, *Demas hath forsaken me*, &c? Or *John*, when he said, *Diotrephes loved to have the preheminence?* Or all those Councils of Bishops which condemned each other, far deeplier than I judge any of them?

What have I said of Fact or Canons, which *Binnius* and their other Flatterers say not? Was it not there extant to the sight of all?

And that I Recorded not all their Virtues, 1. The History of Councils saith little of them. 2. Must no man shew the hurt of Drunkenness, Gluttony, *&c.* and so of Ambition and Church-corruption, unless he will write so Voluminous a History, as to contain also all the good done by all the persons whom he blameth? I have oft said, that I wondered that instead of so greedy gathering up all the scraps of Councils, the Papists did not burn them all, as they have done many better Books which made against them.

§ 2. I was about to answer all his first Chapter, but I find it so useless a work, that I shall ease my self and the Reader of that labour. 1. He takes on him to answer a Piece of a Disputation written about 23 years ago, whereas I have lately written a Treatise of Episcopacy, with fuller proof of the same things, which he nameth, and takes on him to answer some part of it, and answers not: Till he, or some other, shew me the mistakes of that, let them talk on for me in their little Velitations.

2. Most that is considerable which he saith, is answered already in that Book: As his fiction that *Unum Altare* in *Ignatius*, signifieth not an ordinary Communion Table, *&c.* And much more out of *Ignatius*, and many more is added, which he saith nothing to.

3. I have before shewed that he goeth on false Suppositions, that I am only for a Bishop of a single Congregation, or against all, and many such; when yet he himself confesseth the con-

trary, yea derideth me for making Twelve ſorts of Biſhops, and being for ſuch as no Party is like to be pleaſed with.

4 The contradictions and miſtakes are ſo many as would tire the Reader to peruſe an anſwer to them.

And when he hath all done with the numbring of Churches, (over-paſſing the full proof of the Primitive Form of them which I gave as before) he confeſſeth that even his great eſteemed Jeſuite *Valeſius*, [*believes that the City Church was but One even in* Alexandria, *and in* Dionyſius's *time*, p. 64.

And while *p.* 67. he makes *Petavius* and *Valeſius* ſo much to differ, as to gather their contrary Opinions from the ſame words, and conſequently one of them at leaſt underſtood them not, I that profeſs my ſelf not comparable to either of them, ſpecially *Petavius*, in ſuch things, am taken for a falſifier, if I miſunderſtand a word that concerneth not the matter of the Hiſtory.

This therefore being not about Church-Hiſtory ſo much as againſt my Opinion of the Antient Government, when he hath anſwered the foreſaid Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy, if I live not, ſome one may reply, if he deal no better than in this.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of his Second Chapter.

§ 1. PAg. 78. He would have men believe that it is Diſcipline againſt real Hereſie, that I find ſo much fault with, and aſcribe all miſchief to---

Anſw. Utterly contrary to my moſt open Profeſſion: It is only making thoſe things to ſeem Hereſie that are none (either Truth, or meer difference of words, or ſmall miſtakes,) or curing Hereſies by raſh Anathema's, without neceſſary precedent means of Conviction, or by Baniſhment or Blood.

§ 2. Is this it that you defend the Church for, and we oppoſe it for? When we would have none in our Churches whom we know not, and that have not perſonally, if at Age, profeſt underſtandingly their Faith. And what is the Diſcipline that you exerciſe on Hereticks? It's enough that you know them not,

not, and ſo never trouble them. Your Talk and Pamphlets truly complain what ſwarms of Hobbiſts, Sadduces, Infidels, Atheiſts, are among us: Do they not all live in the Pariſhes and Dioceſſes? Doth the Biſhop know them? Are any of them Excommunicated? I could never learn yet how to know who are Members of your Churches: Is it all that dwell in the Pariſhes? Then all theſe aforeſaid, with Jews and Papiſts, are in it: And then why are ten parts of ſome Pariſhes ſuffered without *Diſcipline* to ſhun the Pariſh Church-Communion? Is it all that *hear* you? Then 1. Ten parts in ſome Pariſhes, and two or three, or half in others are not of your Church, and hear you not, and many Nonconformiſts hear you. 2. And any Infidel may hear. Bare hearing was never made a ſufficient note of a Church-Member. 3. And how can you tell who all be that hear you in an uncertain crowd? 4. And why doth not your Diſcipline meddle with conſtant Non-Communicants?

3. Is it only all that Communicate with you? 1. Theſe are yet fewer, and ſo the far greateſt part of many or moſt Pariſhes here are let alone to be no Church members at all, when they have been long Baptized, and no cenſure by diſcipline paſt on them. 2. How know you your ſtated Communicants, when any ſtranger may come unqueſtioned? The truth is, it is Pariſh diſcipline which you will not endure. No wonder if you named it *Iſſachars* burden. *Bucer in ſcrip. Anglic.* and all the Nonconformiſts after him long ſtrove for it in vain. It is the hated thing. Were it poſſible to prevail with you for this, we ſhould have little diſagreement about Church Government. But the Popes that have been the greateſt enemies of it, have yet gloried in a Diſcipline to ſet up their power over Princes and Peoples, and to have their own wills, and tread down all that are againſt them.

§ 2. To extenuate *Anathematizing* (ſo very Common with Councils) he tells us P. 81. that ["*Let him be Anathema imports no more than that we declare our abhorrence of ſuch doctrines, and will have nothing Common with thoſe that profeſs them.*]

Anſ. 1. We may declare our abhorrence of every known ſin and Errour, in ſuch as muſt not be anathematized. 2. By (nothing) I ſuppoſe you mean not [*not* the *ſame King, Countrey, Earth, Air, &c.*] but [*not the ſame Church, the ſame Chriſtian Communion, familiarity, love, &c*] Whether you mean [not the

ſame God, Chriſt, &c.] I know not But do you think the Anathematizing Biſhops ſo unreaſonable, as to renounce all Chriſtian Communion with men and not tell why? Or to give no better Reaſon than [*We abhor their doctrine*:] How few Churches or men have nothing worthy to be abhorred, that is, No Errour or ſin? And muſt we renounce Communion with all the Chriſtian world? No, they were not ſo bad: You uſe them hardlier than I. They took them to be no true Chriſtians, as wanting ſomewhat of that faith which is neceſſary to Salvation, and Eſſential to a Chriſtian, and ſo to have made themſelves no Church-Members, and therefore are to be ſentenced & avoided accordingly.

And how ordinarily do they expound [*Let him be Anathema*] that is [*Cut off from Chriſt?*] Not only *Hildebrand* ſo expounds it often, but many before him: Whereupon they commonly agree that an Anathematized Heretick is none of the Church, nor can be ſaved without repentance.

And indeed to renounce all Communion with Chriſts true members not Cut off from the Church, is a greater ſin than I charge on them. Though familiarity and ſpecially Communion may be ſuſpended, while delay of repentance makes the Caſe of a ſinner doubtful.

§ 3. Pag. 82 He begins himſelf with blaming Biſhop *Victor*, "*for Endangering the Peace of the whole Church upon ſo light occa-*"*ſion.* Valeſius *is of opinion, that it was but by letters of accuſation.*

Anſw. I think it could be but by Letters of Accuſation, Renunciation, and perſuading others to renounce them. For Biſhops were not then come up to their Commanding Power over one another. But doth not Mr. *M*'s. here rail upon a Biſhop, in ſaying the ſame of him that I did, if my words were Railing? Thus you ſhall have him all along confeſſing much of that faultineſs by them, which he takes the mention of by me to be ſo bad.

§ 4. He nameth many Councils, which he ſaith I paſs lightly over; then ſure I ſay no harm of them. He thinks it is becauſe I could not, as if he knew it were my will. And ſo I am never blameleſs.

§ 5. But he hath a notable Controverſie againſt *Baronius*, who thought *Novatus* had been a Biſhop (ſuch Errours as *Baronius* was guilty of by Ignorance, are excuſable in one ſo far below him in Hiſtory as I am.) But I congratulate Mr. *M*'s. diſcovery,

diſcovery, that he was but a Presbyter: But all confeſs that he Ordained *Felicisſimus* Deacon: And here is a Presbyter Ordaining: But it was irregularly! Let it be ſo: He ſaith, that he ought not to have Ordained, but with *Cyprian*, or by his permiſſion. I grant it. But 1. If *Cyprian's* permiſſion would ſerve, then it was not a work alien to a Presbyter: If a permitted Presbyter may Ordain, a Biſhop's Ordination is not neceſſary *ad eſſe Officii*; and ſo that which is a diſorder is no Nullity. 2. And it ſeems by *Novatus's* Act, that the Neceſſity of Epiſcopal Ordination was not univerſally received. And I have not yet met with any that make it more neceſſary *ad eſſe Presbyteratus quam Diaconatus.*

§ 6. Next he mentions another *Carthage* Council, where one *Victor* dead, is condemned for making a Prieſt Guardian of his Child, and ſo entangling him in worldly Affairs. And he tells you, that all that I can ſay againſt this, is the rigour of the Sentence; but he diſſembleth, and takes no notice that I mention it in praiſe of the Biſhops of thoſe Times, who were ſo much againſt Clergy-mens medling with Secular Affairs: What odious Puritaniſm would this have been with us? What I cite in praiſe, our Hiſtorian cannot underſtand.

§ 7. And that you may need no Confuter of much of his Accuſation of me but himſelf, who ſo oft ſaith, I ſay nothing of Biſhops and Councils, but of their faults, *&c.* he here ſaith as followeth.

[" *After this he gives a ſhort Account of Councils called on the* " *Subject of Rebaptization of Hereticks: And here, to do him right,* " *he is juſt enough in his Remarks: The generality of the World* " *was for Rebaptizing Hereticks: And conſidering what manner* " *of men the firſt Hereticks were, it is probable they had Tra-* " *dition as well as Reaſon on their ſide. However, Mr.* Baxter " *endeavours fairly to excuſe theſe Differences, and ſpeaks of the* " *Biſhops with honour and reſpect, allowing them to be men of emi-* " *nent Piety and Worth. Had he uſed the ſame* Candour *towards* " *others*, &c.

Anſw. 1. If this be true, a great deal contradictory is untrue.

2. He greatly miſreporteth the Controverſie: It was not whether Hereticks ſhould be Rebaptized, but thoſe that were *Baptized* by *Hereticks*, and taken into their Churches. If a Heretick had been Baptized when found by a ſound Miniſter, and after

after turned to Hereſie, he was to be reſtored by Repentance without Rebaptizing; and I think they all agreed in this. But I imagine this was but a lapſe of his memory in Writing.

3. But the Queſtion is, Whether the Biſhops, whoſe faults I mention, were of equal Worth and Innocency with thoſe whom I honour and praiſe? Let the proof ſhew.

I would he would freely tell us, Q. 1. Whether he think at this day the generality of Biſhops (in *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, *Germany*, *Poland*, the *Greek* Church, *Moſcovy*, *Armenia*, *Syria*, &c.) are ſo commendable, as not to be notably blamed? Q. 2. If not, When was it that he thinks they ceaſed to be generally ſo commendable? Was it in *Hildebrand*'s Time, or any time before? Q. 3. Can you believe that the generality turn from good to bad juſt in one Age? Or rather that they degenerated by degrees? If they were moſtly bad in a thouſand, or nine hundred, or eight hundred, can you think that they were not drawing towards it and near as bad a little before; Q. 4. What was it think you in which the Corruption of the Clergy did conſiſt? Was it not moſt in a proud, domineering worldly Spirit? Is it not that that you blame the Popes for? Was not their Aſcent their Corruption? Sure you all agree of that. Q. 5. And did the Papacy Spring up in a year? Did not *Leo* begin to arrogate, and others after him (to ſay nothing now of thoſe before him) riſe higher and higher by degrees as Children grow up to manhood, till in *Greg.* 7. it came to Maturity? I know no Proteſtant that denyeth this? Q. 6. And can you or any ſober man think that in ſo many hundred years it was only the Biſhop of *Rome* that was ſick of this diſeaſe, and that all or moſt of the other Biſhops were Free? Were they not commonly for aſcending with them: Did not they in the Eaſt ſtrive to be greateſt? And the Biſhops of the Weſt ſtrive to riſe with, and by the Pope? Were they not, and are they not as his Army? And did he prevail againſt the Primitive Purity and Simplicity without them? Did not his Councils, and Prelates, as his Armies, do his greateſt works? Yea, have they not oft out-done him, and over-topt him in Miſchief (as in the depoſing of *Ludov. Pius* againſt his will? ſay good Hiſtorians.)

Tell us then at what Age juſt we may begin to diſpraiſe the Biſhops. And from that time forward, will you not be as great a Raiſer as I, and ſcandalize Chriſtianity more than *Lucian* or *Julian*?

§ 8. But

§ 8. But I ſomewhat marvel that he is again at it (reciting *Dionyſius*'s words which he thinks I miſtook for *Euſebius*'s) *That he does not condemn the rebaptizing of Hereticks which was a Tradition of ſo great antiquity*: I judge more Candidly of him than he doth of me: Though he ſo oft repeat it, I will not believe that he knew not, that it was not the baptizing of Hereticks as ſuch, that was the queſtion: but only of thoſe that were baptized by Hereticks. Yet I confeſs *Euſebius* phraſing it, might tempt one to think ſo that had not read *Cyprian* and others upon the queſtions. But when *Euſebius* and *Dionyſius* mention [*rebaptizing Hereticks*] they mean only thoſe that were by *Hereticks baptiſm entered into* the *Societies* and *Profeſſion* of *Hereticks*. If the worſt Heretick, yea or Apoſtate, had been baptized, by the orthodox, *Cyprian* and all the reſt were agreed againſt Rebaptizing ſuch when they repented. This *Dionyſius* telling *Xyſtus Rom.* of an ancient Miniſter that was greatly troubled in Conſcience that he had been *falſly Baptized* by an Heretick (being himſelf no Heretick) and doubted whether he ſhould not be Rebaptized, yet ſaith, He told him he durſt not Rebaptize him that had ſo long been in the Church and Communicated, but bid him go on Comfortably in Communion (Much like a forementioned caſe put to me, by ſome that never were Baptized, but in our undiſciplined Pariſh Churches had been without knowledge or queſtion admitted long to Communion, whether yet they ſhould be Baptized at all : And *Dionyſius*'s Reaſons againſt it I cannot anſwer.

§ 9. And here I may take notice how our new Church-men, (ſuch as *Thorndike*, Mr. *Dodwell* and all their partners) who nullifie ſacraments delivered by one that hath not Canonical Ordination by a Biſhop of uninterrupted Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, do make themſelves Hereticks in the ſenſe of the Roman Church which they allow : For 1. Baptiſm is the firſt and moſt neceſſary Sacrament in their own opinion. Yea *Auſtin* and too many of old, but ſpecially too many now, take it to be neceſſary to Salvation ; 2. If therefore Baptiſm be a nullity all that are Baptized in *England*, *Scotland* and all the Proteſtant Churches by ſuch as had no ſuch Ordainers, muſt be Baptized again or be damned. 3. If they ſay, They may be ſaved without it, then 1. they confeſs Mr. *Dodwells* Doctrine to be falſe, that ſaith none have a Covenant right to Salvation, who have it not by a Sacra-

ment

ment from ſuch hands. 2. And they renounce the Doctrine of the Neceſſity of Baptiſm to Salvation. But if they are for Rebaptizing all ſuch Proteſtant Countries, as neceſſary to Salvation, they are uncharitable that do not ſpeak it out.

§ 10. He paſſeth by Biſhop *Stephens* Excommunicating all the Oriental Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Galatia*, and Reprobating their *Synods*, for Rebaptization: Doth he think that even then ſome Biſhops did not riſe too faſt?

§ 11. The man that is ſo angry with me for telling of the faults of Biſhops and Councils, is *pag.* 87. angry with me for not ſaying worſe againſt *Secundus* his Council of Biſhops at *Cirta*; and ſaith, I have not done right to the Catholick Church: I perceive the queſtion is not, whether I may *Rail* at Biſhops, but what Biſhops they be that I muſt Rail at.

As for the Council at *Sinueſſa*, I believed the being of it no more than he doth: And when I am but naming the common Catalogue, he might pardon my modeſty for ſaying that the being of it is a Controverſie.

§ 12. Of the Council of *Illiberis* he ſaith but contractedly the ſame that I do, that *It hath many good Canons, and ſome that need a favourable Interpretation, and is very ſevere in ſome caſes.* This meaſure of juſt praiſe and diſpraiſe, is practiſed by him that is condemning it in me.

§ 13. As to his Controverſie, whether Biſhops, or ſuch as ſtrove to be Biſhops, were the very firſt movers of the *Donatiſts* Controverſie, who ſhould be Biſhop, it's not worth the turning over one Book to ſearch, as to my buſineſs.

§ 14. Next he that accuſeth me of Railing at Biſhops, accuſeth me for ſaying (from ſome good Authors) that a Biſhop of *Carthage*, *Donatus*, was a good man, who he ſaith was *bad*. It's little to me whether he were good or bad.

§ 15. Next he noteth that I Err with *Binnius* and *Baronius* as to the year of a *Carthage* Council. I undertook not to juſtifie all the Chronology or Hiſtory that I tranſcribe: Whether *Optatus*, or *Binnius* and *Baronius* hit on the juſt year, little care I.

§ 16. I praiſed a *Donatiſt*'s Council of 270 Biſhops at *Carthage* for Moderation, agreeing to communicate with penitent Traditors, without Rebaptizing them, and ſo doing for 40 years. Q. What was theſe mens Hereſie?

He

He ſaith, *This looks liker a piece of Policy than Moderation*, for it had *no tendency to peace, but to ſtrengthen the Schiſm.*]

Anſ. Who knows how to pleaſe men? When they exclaim againſt Separation if men Communicate with them, they judge it but Policy, that hath no tendency to peace. 2. And who is it now that moſt raileth at Biſhops? I am confuted for praiſing the moderation of 270 of them, and he is their cenſurer even when they do well, and their moderation with him is but Policy. Even as they ſay, of me, that I conſtantly Communicate with their Pariſh Churches to undermine them: Near or far off, all's one with this ſort of men, if you ſtick at any thing that they bid you ſay or do.

But he will not believe that this Council of Orthodox moderate *Donatiſts* were ſo *many* as 270. "*Becauſe* 1. *we have only the* "*Authority for it of* Tychonius *a* Donatiſt. 2. *It's improbable after* "Conſtantine's *ſuppreſſion of them that Schiſm ſhould ſo ſuddenly* "*ſpread.* 3. *Leſt it ſhould prove the Churches to be too Small: Yet* "*he ſaith, Theſe Schiſmaticks ſet up Churches in every City and* "*Village.*]

Anſ. 1. It's ſaid *Tychonius* confeſſeth this Council, becauſe the later *Donatiſts* would fain have buryed the memory of it: But that it depends only on the Credit of *Tychonius*, I think depends only on your Credit: 2. *Auguſtine* that reports it, honoureth this *Tychonius*, and reciteth an Expoſition of his of the Angels of the Churches, *Rev.* 2. and 3. which I ſuppoſe diſpleaſeth you more than his Donatiſm. 3. It ſeems you would have believed ſome ſtranger that knew it not, rather than a *Donatiſt* that ſpeaketh againſt the will and intereſt of his party. 4. It rather ſeems that the *Donatiſts* were the greater number of Chriſtians there before *Conſtantine*'s time, and like the Papiſts therefore counted themſelves the Catholicks and the others the Schiſmaticks. *Conſtantines* Prohibition did not ſuppreſs them. 5. Therefore the numerouſneſs of their Biſhops and ſmallneſs of Churches, rather ſheweth what was the ſtate of the Churches before worldly greatneſs ſwelled them to that diſeaſe, which was the Embrio or infancy of Popery.

§ 17. Whether the *Donatiſts* be like the Papiſts or the Separatiſts (much leſs to the Nonconformiſts) if the Reader will but peruſe what I have ſaid and what Mr. *M.* hath ſaid, I am content that he judge without more words.

§ 18. He passeth by divers Councils because he could not say that I blame them: And he passeth by *Constantine*'s Epistle to *Alexander* and *Arius*, which *raileth* at them more than I do (in his sence.)

As to the Council of *Laodicea*, it is not two or three such words as his that will make an impartial man believe that the Churches were like our *Dioceſſes*, when every Convert before baptiſm was to say his Catechiſm to the Biſhops or his Presbyters: Or that the Command that Presbyters go ſtill with the Biſhop into the Church, and not before him, do not both imply that they were both together in every Church.

But he will have it confined to the Cathedral; And when I say, There were long no Churches but Cathedrals, he saith he *will not* differ with me whether they ſhall be called *Churches* or *Chappels*. But the difference is *de re*: They say themſelves that A Biſhop and a Church were then Relatives: And when they have put down many hundred Churches under the *Dioceſan*, forſooth they will gratifie us by giving us leave to call them Churches. As if they put down an hundred to one of the Cities and Corporations, and then give us leave, to call them Corporations when they are none. Yet bluſh they not to make the world believe that they are that Epiſcopal party (who put down a thouſand Churches and Biſhops in ſome one *Dioceſs*) and I am againſt Biſhops.

Yea when they have not the front to deny but that every City then had a Biſhop (that had Chriſtians,) and that our Corporations are ſuch as they called Cities, Yet when we plead but at leaſt, if they will have no *Chorepiſcopi*, they will reſtore a Church and Biſhop with his Presbyters to every ſuch City with its adjacent Villages, hatred, ſcorn and deriſion goeth for a Confutation of us; Though we do it but to make true diſcipline a poſſible thing; Which they call *Iſſachar*'s burden, and abhor it, and then ſay, It is poſſible and practiſed.

§ 19. As to the *Roman* Council which he believeth not, he might perceive that I believed at leaſt their antiquity as little as he: But the Canons are ſo like thoſe of following Councils that ſuch it's like were ſometime made.

And whereas I noted that their condemning them that wrong timed Eaſter, would fall on the Subſcribers to our *Engliſh* Liturgy, where 2000 are Silenced for not Subſcribing, the man had

had no better anſwers to give, than theſe 1. That *I ſhould have ſaid the Almanack-Makers.* As if he would have had men believe that Falſhood, that it was the Almanack Makers and not our Liturgy changers that were deceived.

2. [*Alas! one year they miſtook.*] As if he would Perſwade men that their rule faileth but one year, which faileth oft.

3. *The Silenced Miniſters have little Reaſon to thank him or any body elſe, that giveth this Reaſon of their Separation. It's ſtrange this ſhould trouble their Conſciences that Care no more for* Eaſter *than for* Chriſtmas, *but only that it Falls upon a Sunday.*

Here ſee his Hiſtorical Credibility. 1. Would he perſwade men that we give this *Reaſon alone*? Or why may it not be one with twenty more?

2. He intimateth that I give them as reaſons of *Separation*: As if to be *Silenced*, were to *ſeparate*, and to be *paſſive* were to be *active.*

3. He intimateth that as Nonſubſcribers I and ſuch other are Separatiſts, which is falſe; While we live in their Communion.

4. He taketh on him to know our judgment as againſt *Eaſter* (but for *Sunday*) when we never told him any ſuch thing.

5. He intimateth that it's no credit to us that we make Conſcience of deliberate profeſſing *Aſſent* to a known untruth in open matter of fact: And if the Contrary be their Credit, I wiſh they may never be Witneſſes againſt us.

6. He intimateth that a man that is not for keeping *Eaſter*, is the leſs excuſable, if he will not Profeſs a known Falſhood about the time of *Eaſter.* If Conſcience ſtood a man in no ſtead for greater Ends than worldly wealth and eaſe and honour, who would not be a Latitudinarian Conformiſt?

§ 20. Next when I deny belief to theſe Councils, he blames me for making advantage of the Hiſtory of them. As if he ſaw not that I do it, but *ad hominem* to the Papiſts who record them as if they were really true. For it is principally the Papiſts (from Infancy to *Hildebrands* Maturity) againſt whom I write.

§ 21. He next comes to the *Novatians as my Favourite ſect*, And [*Favourite*] may ſignifie to the Reader a truth or a *Falſhood.* 1. Doth not every Chriſtian Favour them that have leſſer Errours more than them that have greater?

2. Do I not as oft as he profeſs my great diſlike of every ſect, as a ſect?

3. Do I not disclaim this Novatian sect and their opinion, and own the Contrary?

4. It seems he taketh me to be too Favourable to some Bishops and their followers: The question is but who they be that must be favoured? I may come to be taken for a Novatian by such men as well as *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.

§ 22. Here (without railing) he bedawbs *Novatus* and *Novatian* to the purpose with *horrid Crimes*, a *Pharisaical Saint*, *Perjured*, and what not? But what! Were they not Episcopal? Yes, he doubts it not: It was for to be a Bishop that *Novatian* wrought his Villanies; (what if I had thus bedawbed the Episcopal?) But yet the very word [*Puritan*] is of use to him. *This*, saith he of *Novatus*, *was the tender Conscience of the author of the Ancient sect of the Puritanes?* Can you tell who the man aimeth at? Is it Nonconformists? *Novatus* & *Novatian* were Prelatists, and never scrupled more Ceremonies than our Prelates impose. Who then can it be but men that in general, though Episcopal, do profess *Tenderness* of *Conscience*? And there I leave them, without the application.

§ 23. But this Defender of Surgent Prelacy, sticks not to disgrace those whom he seemeth to defend. It was three of the Catholick Bishops that Consecrated *Novatian*, and (without railing) he calls them *Three plain ignorant Bishops. These good men suspecting no trick, and overcome with his good entertainment, with too much Wine and perswasions, were forced at last to lay their hands on him and Consecrate him Bishop.*] 1. *Ignorant Bishops*; 2. *Overcome with too much Wine*, and entertainment: 3. And with perswasion: 4. To do such an Act as to Consecrate so bad a Bishop, & that in such a city as *Rome*, and that without the Churches choice or Consent. How much worse have I said of Bishops? But, yet [*they were good men.*] But if they had been Nonconformists, what names had been bad enough for them? No doubt if they had been sequestred and cast out (for their too much wine and such ordination) how odiously might the agents have been described as enemies to the Church and Persecutors of *good men*.

§ 24. Yet further this New Bishop *engageth men to him by Oaths, enough to strike a horror in the minds of the* Reader, saith he. See what a man may do for a Bishoprick? It reminds me of many good Canons that forbid Bishops swearing their Clergy to them: And of our *Et Catera* Oath in 1640 never to Consent to any

any alteration, (to say nothing of our times) and the old Oath of Canonical obedience. It strikes *horror* into mens minds now that we scruple these.

§ 25. He maketh the Novatian doctrine *blasphemous* (without railing) and me too Favourable in representing it. As to that I suppose he is not ignorant how great a Controversie it is what they held, even among the greatest Antiquaries, and Enemies of Schism and Heresie. And I use in accusations to meet with most truth in the most Favourable interpretations.

And here I will tell our Historian, that while I take leave to dissent from his accusation, it shall be but by the authority of those whom I judge as well acquainted with Church Writers and Customes as any that ever Mr. *M.* or any of his Masters read, not excepting more knowing men than *Valesius*.

The first is D. *Petavius* in *Epiphan. de Cath.* Where first he tells us, that no less nor later men than *most of the ancient Fathers*, and *Specially* the *Greeks*, mistook *Novatus* and *Novatian* for one, or thought the sect had a single Author; naming *Euseb. Theodoret, Epiphan. Nazian. Ambrose, Austin, Philastrius*, yea and *Socrates*. Yet half as great a mistake in me would have been scorned.

2. Against *Epiph.* and *Theodoret* he saith [*Non ea Novatiani Opinio fuit, eos qui gravioris peccati noxam contraherent, ab omni spe consequendæ salutis excludi: Nam & illos ad capessendam pœnitentiam hortari solebant: Et ut Divinam clementiam lachrymis ac sordibus elicerent identidem admonebant: Sed hoc unum negabant; ad Ecclesiæ fidelium Communionem recipi amplius oportere: Neque penes Ecclesiam reconciliandi jus ullum ac potestatem esse: Quippe unicam illam peccatorum indulgentiam in illius arbitrio versari, quæ per Baptismum obtinetur*; which he proveth out of *Socrates, Ambrose*. And he saith, that they were not counted Hereticks for wronging the lapsed, by denying them Communion, but for wronging the Church Power, by denying the Power of the Keyes for their Restitution. (Like enough.)

The other shall be that excellent Bishop *Albaspineus Observ. lib. 2. Observ. 20, 21. p. (mihi)* 130, 131. [*Advertant Novatianorum errorem non in eo positum, quod dicerent neque lapsum, neque excommunicatum in morte à peccatis liberandum; sed hæreticos ideo habitos, quod opinarentur Deum ipsum Ecclesiæ neque remittendorum neque retinendorum peccatorum capitalium potestatem*

copiamque

copiamque feciſſe: Atque hæc in eo fuit viguitque eorum hæreſis, qui quanquam illud conſequeretur ex eorum falſa Opinione, ut abſolutionem non largirentur, tamen hoc eorum factum non hæreſis nomine afficiendum erat, neque ad hæreſin accedebat ob aliam cauſam quam quod à fonte illo & quaſi capite hæreſin olente dimanârat, eo maxime quod Novatiani crederent id Eccleſiæ a Deo non fuiſſe præſtitum & conceſſum; quæ cauſa ſola fuit cur praxis illa cen diſciplinæ Novatianorum ratio hæreſis nomen notionemque non effugeret.]

The Clergy felt their own Intereſt, and the *Novatians* denied their Power to retain, as well as *forgive* capital Crimes, and thought their Keyes extended not ſo far.

And that the Caſe of the lapſed was it that they began with, *Epiphanius* himſelf and others agree.

And *Obſerv.* 19. he ſhews that *Novatianus* did this againſt his former Judgment, in Envy and Faction againſt the Biſhop, becauſe he miſt of being Biſhop himſelf. A Biſhoprick was it that provoked him to deny this Pardoning Power in Biſhops.

And *Albaſpineus* hath in many antecedent Obſervations ſhewed, how little, if any thing at all, the *Novatians* differed elſe from the Antient Church in the ſtrictneſs of their Communion, and avoiding ſinners: So that he thus begins his fifth Obſervation [*Incredibilia prope ſunt, quæ his capitibus dicturi ſumus: ſed tamen ita vera & certa, & quæ cujuſque animam ſummam in admirationem rapiant, Eccleſiam primis temporibus nulla vel leviſſima labe inquinatam fuiſſe; quin ita illibatam intactamque ut omni ratione, curâ & ſolicitudine proſpexerit, filii ut ſui quam à Baptiſmo hauſerant puritatem eam nulla aſperſam vitii alicujus macula & fœditate conſervarent. Imo ea ſe veritate adhibita ut fugiendum ſibi deteſtandumque peccatum, quovis terrore propoſito putarent. Non ſolum autem multa crimina peccataque numerabantur, quorum Authores artificeſque abſolutionem omnem deſperabant, ſed & ea quoque quibus ignoſcet pœnitentiam concedi opertere cenſuerat, peccata ita ulciſcebatur, lut non niſi ſemel eis qui ea commiſiſſent, unius pœnitentiæ copiam faceret Eccleſia, hoc eſt ſi poſt Baptiſmum lethaliter peccaſſent. Quod ſi cum Eccleſia reconciliatus in idem aut aliud mortale peccatum iterum prolaberetur, ita in perpetuum tribus primis ſæculis ab Eccleſia repulſam ferebat, ut non niſi pœnitentiæ & in morte precum quæ reliqua erant ſubſidia expectanda ſibi duceret, nulla abſolutione data quæ in ſpem veniæ illum erigeret.*] And he adds, that many that cannot deny his proofs,

proofs, yet will not believe that ever ſuch a Diſcipline was uſed.

But this was in the three Firſt Ages: After, when Proſperity and Wealth ticed the ungodly into Biſhops Seats, and into the Church, the Caſe was altered, and as he ſhews, *Obſerv.* 6. the Caſe was ſo altered to the looſe extreme, that Criminals were admitted *toties quoties*. And in his Notes on *Tertullian* he ſheweth, that this was a difference between the Orthodox and the Hereticks, that the Orthodox did *diu multumque deliberare quos in ſocietatem ejuſdem Eccleſiæ, & corporis recipere debeant*; but the Hereticks were ready to take all that came. Yet I ſuppoſe not near ſo looſe as thoſe Dioceſan and Parochial Churches that know not who comes, but without queſtion take all that will but come to the Rails and kneel: And when by the magnitude of Dioceſs and other means, they have ſecured themſelves againſt the trouble and poſſibility of Paſtoral Diſcipline, the Prieſt wipes off all guilt with a word, and ſaith, If they were Atheiſts, Hobbiſts, Sadduces, Whoremongers, common Blaſphemers, Drunkards, it's no fault of mine, I know it not; and no wonder, when he knoweth not who in the Pariſh are his Flock.

That *Euſebius* himſelf and others named by *Petavius* miſtook the Novatians is no wonder to thoſe who read the volumes of palpable Falſhood written againſt the Nonconformiſts in this preſent age, and hear witneſſes at the bar ſwear thoſe Plots and Conſpiracies & Treaſons againſt men, from which grave and conſcionable Juries quit them.

But me thinks when Mr. *M.* had ſaid that *Socrates is an Hiſtorian of good Credit and acquainted with them*] he much forgot his own ends when he recited theſe words as his [*Some took part with* Novatian, *and others with* Cornelius; *according to their ſeveral inclinations and Courſe of life: The looſer and more licentious ſort Favouring the moſt indulgent diſcipline, the other of more auſtere lives inclining moſt to the Novatian ſeverity.*] Good ſtill, I now ſee that the Novatians indeed were Puritanes, though Epiſcopal, and I accuſe not our accuſers of any ſuch Hereſie. But I confeſs that I ſhall believe a Novatian Hiſtorian, who being ſo ſtrict againſt ſin muſt be ſtrict againſt a Lie, rather than thoſe that Scorn ſuch Puritaniſm, and deride the Perſon that cannot ſwallow a bigger Pill.

And when Mr. *M.* labours to ſhew out of *Socrates* that it was

was not only Idolatry that they cenſured, he labours in vain: It was the *beginning* of their Schiſm that I mentioned, and not *Socrates* his Age.

As to the judgment of the Council of *Eliberis* and all the three Firſt Ages, I have told you what *Albaſpine* ſaith before. If you can confute him, do; I am not engaged to defend him; but I believe him.

§ 26. I conclude this and the former Chapter with this Counſel to the Scorners of Puritanes: Never truſt to your Titles and Order, how good ſoever, without a careful holy obedience to the Supreme Law-giver, either for Concord on Earth, or Salvation in Heaven. True Pariſh-Reformation is the way to ſatisfie godly perſons better than either Violence or Separation. But if you ſtill obſtinately reſiſt Pariſh-Diſcipline and Reformation, you muſt have Toleration of ſuch as will not conſent to your Corruption, or elſe perſecute the beſt to your own ruine. *Theophilus Parochialis* hath ſaid more for Pariſh Order againſt the Regulars, and Priviledged, than you have done againſt the Separatiſts. And yet the Confraternity of the *Oratorians* ſet up in every Pariſh, was the beſt way he could deviſe to recover the ſtate of lapſed Pariſhes: As the priviledging of Fryars was the Pope's laſt Remedy inſtead of Reforming his corrupted Church.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Council of Nice *and ſome following.*

§ 1. THis Hiſtorian having put himſelf into a military poſture ſeemeth to conceit that every word proceeds from an Enemy. And firſt he feigneth me to make *Conſtantine* judge that [*the Biſhops and Councils were of little uſe*] when I had no ſuch *word or thought*, but the contrary.

§ 2. Next he himſelf confeſſeth that which I blame thoſe Biſhops for; Even thoſe Libels which they Contentiouſly offered againſt one another; to have raiſed Quarrels inſtead of Peace, and which *Conſtantine* caſt altogether into the fire without reading them. And when he confeſſeth what I ſay, is he not a Railer at the Biſhops as much as I in that?

As

As to his excuſe that [*It is no wonder conſidering their great diſſentions in Religion, &c.*] I eaſily grant it: But in this excuſe he ſaith yet more againſt them.

§ 3. Becauſe I ſaid that *Athanaſius* differing from *Conſtantine* about the reception of *Arius* his repentance [*Cauſed much Calamity*] he feigneth me heinouſly to accuſe *Athanaſius* which I intended not: Even a juſt action may [*Cauſe Calamity*] as Chriſt ſaith his Goſpel would bring diviſion. All his labour in juſtifying *Athanaſius* fighteth but with a ſpectre of his own imagination. And yet I am inclined to think that if an Hypocrite *Arius* had been connived at to pleaſe ſuch an Emperor, the death of *Arius* would have left the Church quieter than it did; though he here thinks greater rigour had been ſafer: And I think multitudes of Sadduces, Infidels and debaucht Perſons in one of our Dioceſſes, yea or Pariſhes, is worſe than one *Arius* while Hypocriſie reſtrained him from Venting his opinion.

§ 4. And here he that dreamed I accuſed *Athanaſius*, really accuſeth *Conſtantine* as *impoſed on by a Counterfeit Repentance and reſtoring the incendiary to opportunities of doing miſchief, and* being againſt the means that *might have ended that fatal miſchief.* But I confeſs *Conſtantine* was no Biſhop, and therefore this is not an *accuſation of Biſhops* or a railing at them.

§ 5. Next when I had fully opened the Caſe of the *Meletians* out of *Epiphanius* on pretence of abbreviating, he leaves out that which he likes not, and tells us how the Nonconformiſts have advantaged the Papiſts: If I thought the man believed himſelf I would try to undeceive him: In the mean time I deſire him to think again which party moſt befriends the Papiſts; "They "that are for a reconciliation with them on theſe terms, that "there may be acknowledged an Univerſal ſupreme human "Power over all the Church on Earth, and the Pope to be *Prin-* "*cipium Unitatis* and Patriarch of the Weſt, and he ſhall abate us "the laſt 400 years Impoſitions, and all be accounted Schiſma- "ticks that unite not into this Church; and that all the "Preachers in *England* ſhall be ſilenced that will not ſwear, pro- "miſe, profeſs, and practiſe all that which is here impoſed on "them, though they think it heinous ſin, and others think it but "matter indifferent, and all the people ſhall be proſecuted that "hear them; and that this Diviſion ſhall rather weaken the "Kingdom, and advantage the Papiſts, than the Conſciences

" of men, as wiſe and faithful as themſelves ſhall be eaſed of " ſuch Impoſitions, or they ſuffered to Preach the Goſpel of " Chriſt: Or thoſe that being condemned to ſuch Silence, Pri- " ſons and Ruine, had rather be delivered, though a Papiſt be " delivered with them, than be deſtroyed.] Methinks we are uſed by theſe Church-Fathers, as if they ſhould determine that a great part of the Proteſtants who are moſt againſt Popery, ſhall be hanged, unleſs the Papiſts will beg their pardon, or cut the Rope; which if theſe Proteſtants accept, they ſhall be ſaid to be the Promoters of the Papiſts.

§ 6. As for all his Exceptions againſt *Epiphanius*, they are nothing to me, who did not undertake to juſtifie his words, but tranſcribe them; nor think it worth my labour now to examine the Caſe of ſo ſmall concernment.

§ 7. When ſome have blamed me for condemning the *Arians* too much, he ſaith, that I ſay ſomewhat very much to the diſadvantage of the Doctrine of the Trinity, but he was ſo gentle as not to tell what it was, unleſs it be telling what *Petavius* the Jeſuite ſaith: About that I am wholly of his own mind. But the expreſs words which *Petavius de Trinit.* citeth out of all thoſe Old Fathers, cannot be denied: And verily they are ſo many, and ſo groſs, that unleſs his Argument ſatisfied me, *viz.* [*The Votes of the Council of* Nice *ſhewed what was the Common ſence of the Church, better than the words of all thoſe Fathers*] I ſhould think as *Philoſtorgius* in point of Hiſtory, that there were no ſufficient confuting of the *Arians* from thoſe Fathers, though ſometimes they have better words. Viſible words cannot be denied, even where they muſt be lamented. That's the difference between Mr. *M's.* Opinion of Hiſtory and mine.

§ 8. As to the *Audians*, I recite but *Epiphanius's* words, who in other caſes is greatly valued by theſe Accuſers: They will believe what he ſaith of *Aerius*. And as to what he ſaith to the contrary out of *Theodoret*, he may ſee that he ſaith all by hearſay, and ſaith, that *They hid* that which he accuſeth them of, and were Hypocrites, profeſſing too much ſtrictneſs, *l.* 4. *c.* 9. which is ſtill the common way of accuſing the beſt, againſt whom inſtead of proveable faults, they turn their ſtrictneſs into a crime. *Epiphanius* is much more particular than *Theodoret* in the ſtory.

§ 9. The reſt which he noteth of my words of the Council of

of *Nice*, have nothing needing a reply. *Petavius* hath fully proved that the *Chorepiſcopi* were true Biſhops. But now we are odious Presbyterians if we would but have a Biſhop in every City, that is, Corporation, Deſiring only that Diſcipline might become poſſible. And for this we are proclaimed to be againſt Biſhops; that is, ſaith this ſort of men; They that would have but One Biſhop over a thouſand, or many hundred, or ſcore Churches, are for Epiſcopacy; and they that would have every Church have a Biſhop, as of old, or at leaſt every great Town, and ſo would have twenty, or forty, or a hundred for one, are againſt Epiſcopacy: And that which is ſtrange is, Theſe men are believed.

§ 10. I praiſed the Council of *Gangra* for condemning ſome Superſtitions, and he ſaith, I have nothing againſt it: Whether it be a *Common Miſtake* that *Arius* was here received to Communion, I'le not ſtay to examine.

§ 11. When he hath weighed all he can for the Synod at *Antioch*, he is forced to confeſs that they were a packt company of Biſhops, that complied with *Conſtantius* and *Euſebius*'s Contrivance. And what do I ſay worſe of them than he? As to the Canon againſt Prieſts or Deacons not gathering Aſſemblies againſt the Biſhops will, I am for it as much as he, if the Biſhops and Churches be ſuch as they were then; but not in *France* nor *Italy*.

He ſaith, *I leave my ſting behind me, and end very angrily*; for theſe only words [*This is their ſtrength*] mentioning the Councils (that was againſt *Athanaſius*) ſuppreſſing Diſſenters as ſeditious by force. I ſee angry men think others angry when they are, and are ſtung if we do but name their ſtinging us: As if Priſons and Ruine were not ſo ſharp a ſting as theſe four words. If it be not their ſtrength, why do they ſo truſt to it, as to confeſs that their Arguments and Keyes would do little to uphold their Prelacy without it. In the daies of the Uſurpers I moved for a Petition, that when they granted Liberty of Conſcience for ſo many others, they would grant Liberty for the full exerciſe of the Epiſcopal Government to all that deſired it. But the Epiſcopal Party that I ſpake to, would not endure it, as knowing what bare Liberty would be to their Cauſe, unleſs they could have the Sword to ſuppreſs thoſe that yield not to their Reaſons.

§ 12. Next he ſaith, I ſpare my Gall for about a dozen

times, not regarding how it contradicts his former Accusations.

But whereas I recite the horrid Accusations of the Council at *Philippopolis* against *Athanasius*, *Paulus* and *Marcellus*, of open Matters of Fact, as Murder, Persecutions, Burning of Churches, Wars, Flames, Dragging Priests to the Market-place with Christs Body tyed about their necks, stripping Consecrated Virgins naked before a concourse of People [and offering to send messengers on both sides to Try the Fact, and to be themselves condemned if it prove not true] he is offended that I seem *staggered* at this, *Athanasius* having detected before so many Subornations, *&c.*

Answ. I did not say that I was staggered, much less doubted which of them did the wrong: But that a Reader may by such a Temptation be astonished, and confounded whom to believe. But did I ever rail more at Bishops than he here doth? What 1. So great a number of Bishops, 2. Deliberately in Council, 3. To affirm so vehemently, 4 Such matters of open Fact, 5. And offer it to the Trial of Witnesses of both sides; and all this to be false, 6. And to be but the consequent of former Subornations and Perjury; can you name greater wickedness?

Obj. But they were *Arians*. *Answ.* But they were Bishops. The worse for being *Arians*. 2. Yet called but *Semi-Arians*, and renounced *Arius*, and pretended Reconciliation. 3. And they were the Oriental part of the Council at *Sardica*, called *General* by the Papists. 4. And they were believed against *Marcellus* by *Basil* and *Chrysostom*: But all that I cite it for, is to tell the Reader what a doleful case the Church was faln into, by the depravation of the Bishops. Did none of these profess before to be Orthodox? I do not say that it was *quatenus* Bishops that they did all this, but that multitudes of Bishops were then become the shame and calamity of the Church.

§ 13. Next he scorningly accuseth me for giving too soft a Character of the *Circumcellians*; and saith, *My Moderation and Charity may extend to* John *of* Leyden. And he calls them *The Most barbarous and desperate Villains that ever defamed Christianity by assuming the Title.*]

Ans. 1. This is the man that saith I rail. I named so many and great sins of theirs, that I little thought any Reader would have thought that I spared them too much. 2. Yet they were *Donatists*, and of them *Optatus* himself saith, *lib.* 5. ["*Apud vos*

"&

" *& apud nos Una eſt Eccleſiaſtica converſatio; Communes Le-*
" *ctiones: Eadem Fides; ipſa Fidei Sacramenta, eadem myſte-*
" *ria*] that is, ſaith *Albaſpine* [*Una Eccleſiaſtica diſciplina: Eodem modo Scripturas Explicamus: Ipſa Regula Fidei: Idem Myſterium quod confertur & ſignificatur, & eadem res viſibilis per quam res ſpiritualis datur*] in *lib.* 5. *p.* 153.

And ſaith *Optatus*, *lib.* 1. [*Nequis dicat me inconſiderate eos fratres appellare, qui tales ſunt. Quamvis & illi non negent & omnibus notum ſit, quod nos odio habeant, & execrentur, & nolunt ſe dici fratres noſtros; tamen nos recedere à timore Dei non poſſumus---ſunt igitur ſine dubio fratres quamvis non boni: Quare nemo miretur eos me appellare fratres, qui non poſſunt non eſſe fratres.*

Obj. But the *Circumcellians* were worſe than the reſt.

Anſw. They were of the ſame Religion, but the unruly furious part in their practice: And *Optatus* ſaith, Though they would rail in words [*ſed unum quidem vix invenimus cum quo per literas, vel hoc modo loquatur:*] And ſo goes on to call *Parmenian* his Brother. And it's worth the conſideration how much *Albaſpine* includeth in *Fraternity*; note firſt, *& in Obſervat.*

3. And they were Orthodox fierce Prelatiſts, doing all this for the preheminence of their Biſhops. And what if *ſome Prelatiſts now* ſhould hurt their Brethren more than the *Circumcellians* did, muſt I call them therefore *the moſt barbarous Villains that ever defamed Chriſtianity.* *Auguſtine* ſaith, They made a Water of ſome Salt or ſharp thing, and caſt in mens Eyes in the night in the ſtreets: No man can think that this barbarous action was done by the moſt, or any but ſome furious fools: They ſay that they would wound themſelves to bring hatred on the Catholicks, as if they had done it, or drove them to it: He that knoweth what Self-love is, will believe that this was the caſe but of a few; and an eaſier wrong than ſome that abhor them do to their Brethren. And muſt we needs Rail indeed againſt ſuch numbers of hurtful Prelatiſts? What if any rude perſons of your Church ſhould be Whoremongers, Drunkards, Blaſphemers, and ſeek the Impriſonment of their Brethren, yea their Defamation and Blood by Perjury, ſhould the Church be for their ſakes ſo called, as you call them? I ſpeak them no fairer than *Optatus* did.

§ 14. When *p.* 57. I commend the many good Canons of the *African* Councils, and the faithfulneſs of the Biſhops, he noteth none

none of this, becauſe it proveth the untruth of his former Accuſations.

And when I name twenty five or twenty ſix more Councils of Biſhops, ſome General, and ſome leſs, which were for Arianiſm, or a compliance with them, he defendeth none of them, but excuſeth them, and ſaith, that [*they were not much to the honour of the Church: Yet the evil Edicts and Conſequences of them are rather to be charged on the* Arian *Emperour, than the Biſhops.*]

Anſw. 1. This is the ſame man that elſewhere ſo overdoes me in accuſing the *Arians.*

2. The Emperour was Erroneous, but ſaid to be otherwiſe very commendable. And is it not more culpable for Biſhops to Err in the Myſteries of *Divinity*, than a Lay-man? And for many hundred to Err, than for *One Man?* And do you think that the Biſhops Erring did not more to ſeduce the Flocks, than the Emperour's?

But he ſaith, that [*If many fell in the Day of Tryal, they are rather to be pitied, than inſulted over, for we have all the ſame infirmities*, &c.

Anſw. I wrote in pity of them and the Church, without any inſulting purpoſe. If any now to avoid lying in Priſon, and ſtarving their Families, by Famine, ſhould ſurrender their Conſciences to ſinful Subſcriptions after a Siege of Nineteen years, I ſhall pity them, and not inſult over them. Nay, if I ſpeak of thoſe that lay the Siege, and call out for more Execution, I do it not inſultingly, but with a grieved heart for the Church and them.

But when I largely recited *Hillary*'s words of them, he ſaith, [*The Account is very ſad*] (and what ſaid I more?) *But*, ſaith he, *yet ſuch as ſhews rather the Calamity, than the Fault of the Biſhops.*]

Anſw. Nay then, no doubt, it's no fault to Conform. *Hillary* then, and all that kept their ground, were in a great fault for ſo heavily accuſing them. And ſo the World turned *Arians* in ſhew (as *Hierom* and *Hillary* ſpeak) is much acquit, and the Nonconformiſts are the faulty Railers for accuſing them. It had been enough to ſay, *It was no Crime*; but to ſay, *no Fault*, is too gentle for the ſame man that ſo talkt of Perjured *Arians* before.

§ 15. Yet becauſe he is forced to confeſs that it was *moſt by far* of all the Biſhops, even in *Councils* (he of *Rome* not excepted)

cepted) that thus fell, he muſt ſhew how it offended him to be forced to it, by telling the world how contentious *I have been againſt all ſorts and Sects* (the firſt is falſe, and he knows it I think, and the latter is true formally of a *Sect as ſuch*; even his *own Sect.*) And *ſome judge me ſuch a ſtranger to Peace, as to need a Moderator to ſtand between me and the Contradictions of my own Books.*]

Anſw. Yes, the Biſhops Advocate *Roger L'Eſtrange*, where nothing but groſs ignorance, or malice, or negligence, could have found Contradictions, were the whole places peruſed. And where I am ſure my ſelf, that there is none; I have ſomewhat elſe to do than to write more, to ſhew the Calumnies of ſuch Readers. Who moſt ſeeks Peace, you, or thoſe that you proſecute? One would think it ſhould not be hard to know if men be willing.

CHAP. XX.

Of the firſt General Council at Conſtantinople. His *Cap.* 4.

§ 1. HE begins with accuſing me of imitating the Devil; Doth *Job ſerve God for nought*? becauſe I ſay that [*the reaſon why the Weſt was freer from the* Arian *Hereſie, than the Eaſt, was not as the Papiſts ſay, that Chriſt prayed for* Peter, *that his Faith might not fail, but becauſe the Emperours in the Weſt were Orthodox, and thoſe in the Eaſt* Arians: And the Biſhops much followed the Emperour's will.]

What, ſaith he, *can be more unchriſtian*?

Anſw. 1. I never ſaid that this was the *Only Cauſe*.

2. I proved that this Priviledge of *Rome* was not the meaning of Chriſt's Prayer.

3. Is not this the ſame man that even now hid the fall of far more Biſhops, even moſt in the World, on the Emperour, as overcoming them by force and fraud?

4. Doth not God himſelf keep men uſually from ſtrong temptations, when he will deliver them from ſin?

5. Were not the Eaſtern Biſhops, and the Weſtern, of the ſame mold and temper? And if the Eaſtern followed the Emperours,

rours, had not the Weſtern been in danger if they had the like temptation?

6. Doth not *Baſil* that ſent to them for help, complain of them as proud, and no better than their Brethren?

7. Did not *Marcellinus* fall to Idolatry, and *Liberius* to ſubſcribe againſt *Athanaſius* with the *Arians*?

8. Did not the Weſt actually fall to Arianiſm when tempted for the moſt part? Judge by the great Council at *Milane*, and by *Hillary*'s complaints.

9. Hath *Rome* and the Weſt ſtood faſter to the Truth ſince then? What! all the Popes who are by Councils charged with Hereſie or Infidelity, and all wickedneſs, and thoſe many whoſe Lives even by *Baronius* and *Genebrard*, are ſo odiouſly deſcribed? Is the Weſt at this day free from Popery and its fruits?

10. Do you think in your conſcience that if we had not here a Proteſtant King, but a Papiſt, many of the Clergy would not be Papiſts? Why then are they ſo in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Poland*, &c? And why did the moſt of them turn in Qu. *Mary*'s daies? I do not inſult, but lament the Churches Caſe, which ever ſince Wealth and Honour, and too much Power corrupted it, have had Biſhops far more worldly, and leſs faithful than they were the firſt three hundred years. Though I ſtill ſay that ever ſince, God hath in all times raiſed ſome ſerious Believers that have kept up ſerious Piety in the Church: And as I doubt not but there are ſo many ſuch among the Conformiſts, as is our great Joy, ſo I hope that, though foully blotted with Superſtition and Errour, there are many ſuch among the Papiſts themſelves.

§ 2. Yet he ſaith, *I do the Biſhops Right again, without thinking of doing them Juſtice, while I tell how many were murdered.*

Anſw. 1. Doth he know my thoughts? 2. It's true I intended not to do any other Juſtice, than to praiſe Chriſt's Martyrs and Confeſſors, while I lament the Caſe of Perſecutors and Revolters? Is the praiſe of Confeſſors any honour to the Hereticks?

But perhaps he means, I right the Order of Biſhops. *Anſw.* Did I ever ſay or think that there were no Biſhops that kept the Faith? Do I ſay All fell, when I ſay Moſt fell? The Man ſpeaks as his imagined Intereſt leads him, and ſo interpreteth my words to his own ſenſe, not as written. And if that be the

right

right way, I think he will grant that there were more Martyrs and Sufferers under *Valens*, *Conſtantius*, *Hunnericus*, and *Genſericus*, in the Eaſt, and in *Africk*, by far, than were when their Tryal came in all the Weſt that is now ſubject to the Pope. And what moved the man to dream that when I ſo deſcribe and praiſe their conſtancy in Suffering, I did it as at unawares?

That the greater part of the Biſhops of the Empire were *Arians*, I will not offer by Teſtimony to prove, when it is ſo commonly by Fathers, Hiſtorians, by Papiſts and Proteſtants agreed on. How many of them were Biſhops before, and how many but Presbyters or Deacons, I'le not pretend to number. The turning of multitudes all agree on. The Conſtancy of many he falſly intimateth that I deny, and ſaith, *I injuriouſly repreſent them*, and cannot tell a word wherein that Crime is found.

§ 3. Naming the things that were done by the Council at *Conſtantinople*, I mention both the ſetting up, and after the putting down of *Gregory*; & leſt any Caviller ſhould carp at the word [*putting down*] I preſently open particularly what it was that they did toward it; that reſolving on his depoſition, they cauſed him, though unwilling, rather to give it up, than ſtay till they caſt him out. This great Hiſtorian had no more manlike an Exception here, than to ſay, that againſt all Hiſtory, and againſt my own Explication, I ſay that [*They Depoſed him.*] I ſaid [*They put him down*] in the manner, and as far as I explained.

§ 4. While he here himſelf accuſeth the *Times* then of *General Corruption*, and the *Church* of *Diviſions*, adding, [*What Age hath been ſo happy as not to labour under thoſe Evils?*] he accuſeth me of making miſuſe of *Gregory*'s words, to repreſent the Council in an odious manner.

Anſw. It is to repreſent the worſer part in a lamentable manner, as far as *Gregory* did, and no further. And as to his quarrel at my citation, I ſhall ſay no more; but if the Reader will but read *Gregory*'s own words, I willingly leave all that Cauſe to his Judgment: If he will not, my words cannot inform him.

Yet he himſelf ſaith [*He doth indeed in ſeveral places find fault with this Council*] And can you forgive him? I think I find no more than he did. But for this *you* find fault *with him* [*He did reſent the Injury* (And was it an *Injury?*) *and did not bear the deprivation of his Biſhoprick with the ſame generoſity he propoſed, which made him a little more ſharp than was decent in his repre-*

ſentation of the Biſhops---What wonder if ſharpened with diſcontent, he exclaim with ſomewhat too great a paſſion againſt the adminiſtration of the Church which he had been forced to quit] *Anſ.* All will be confeſt *anon*, when I have been accuſed for ſaying it before him: That's his way. But it was not for leaving a high and fat Biſhoprick that he was grieved, but for being ſeparated from the People that he had partly ſerved in their lower ſtate, and partly won from Hereſie, and who came about him with tears intreating him not to forſake them. And though it were more than *generoſity* to ſet light by the Honour and Wealth, it is treachery to ſet light by Souls: And they changed to their great loſs. He reſigned much to quiet the People leſt they ſhould do as they did for *Chryſoſtom* after him. It is no new thing for the Major vote of the Clergy to Envy thoſe few that are better and more eſteemed than themſelves, nor yet for the Godly People to be loth to leave ſuch paſtors.

§ 5. He ſaith [*His cenſure of Councils that he knew none of them that have any happy End, was not the fault of the expedient, but of the men*] *Anſ.* And what did I ever ſay more. It is his cuſtom when he hath ſtormed at me, to ſay in Effect the ſame that he ſtormed at. Some Papiſts would perſuade men, that it was only *Arian* Councils that he meant, but moſt Proteſtants that Write about Councils againſt them, do cite & vindicate theſe words of *Gregory*: And the impartial Papiſts confeſs that it was the Councils alſo of the Catholicks that there and elſe where he ſpake of.

§ 6. In the Caſe of *Meletius*, and *Paulinus*, two Biſhops in a City, and the Caſe of *Luciſer Calaritanus* made a Heretick for ſeparating from lapſed *Arians*, he ſaith over the ſame that I do; that *good men cannot rightly underſtand one another, and ſo it ever hath been, and it's the Effect of humane frailty and not Epiſcopacy.* In all this I agree. But 1. If humane frailty make Biſhops ſwell in pride and ambition, and domineering, it hath far worſe Effects than in other men: 2. And Biſhops are bound to excell their flocks in Piety, humility, Selfdenyal, peaceableneſs, as well as in knowledge. If the Phyſicians of this city ſhould prove unskilful, and yet confident where they err, it is not *quatenus Phyſicians* that they are ſuch: But if it be *qui* Phyſicians that are ſuch, they may kill thouſands, while the ſame faults in all their neighbours may kill few or none. If your Intereſt made you not ſmart and angry without cauſe, you would not cavil againſt ſuch plain truth.

§ 7. About

§ 7. About the Priſcillianiſts he ſaith [*I all along obſerve this Rule, to be very favourable to all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks be they never ſo much in the wrong, and to fall on the Orthodox party and improve every miſcarriage of theirs into a mighty crime.*]

Anſ. If all along this accuſation be falſe, then all a long your Hiſtory ſerveth ſuch a uſe. But in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, he is favourable to Hereticks that takes not the orthodox for ſuch, or that is not for racking and burning them. And in *England* he is favourable to Schiſmaticks that taketh not the greateſt lovers of Piety and peace for ſuch, and the Church Tearers for Church-Healers: As Mr. *Dodwell* phraſeth it, they are Schiſmaticks that *ſuffer themſelves to be excommunicate* (for unſinful things in the Biſhops account, and heinous ſin in theirs; and ſo that are not ſo ripe in Knowledge, as to know all the *unſinful things* to be ſuch which may be impoſed.

§ 8. What would this enemy of railing have had me ſaid more than I did of the Priſcillianiſts? *viz.* that they were *Gnoſticks and Manichees?* Was not that bad Enough. No, I favour them ſtill? And what ſay I more of the Biſhops and the whole cauſe, than *Sulpitius Severus* the fulleſt and moſt knowing Deſcriber ſaith? Why doth he not accuſe him for the ſame deſcription? Yea and their Mr. *Ri. Hooker* who in the Preface to his *Eccl. Pol.* ſaith of *Ithacius* the like? Yea *Baronius* himſelf conſenteth? Where I ſay that to the death *Martin* ſeparated from the ſynods of theſe Biſhops (I ſaid not from all Biſhops in the world) he ſaith, he *renounced only the Communion of* Ithacius *his Party, and that others did as well as he.* Reader, it will be thy folly to take either his word or mine, what an Author ſaith, when we differ, without looking into the Book it ſelf. Read *Sulpitius Severus*; I will tranſcribe ſome words, leſt he ſay, I miſtranſlate them.

"*Priſcillianus, familia nobilis, prædives opibus, acer, inquies,* "*facundus, multa lectione eruditus, diſſerendi & diſputandi prom-*"*ptiſſimus---vigilare multum, famem & ſitim ferre poterat, habendi* "*minime cupidus, utendi parciſſimus* (Was it a crime to ſay ſo "much good of him?) But proud of his Learning, ſet up a He-"reſie, and two Biſhops *Inſtantius* and *Salvianus* ioyned with "him, and made him a Biſhop---At *Caſar Auguſta* one Synod "was gathered againſt him. The Story I before recited. Next "a Synod at *Burdeaux* tryeth them. Saith *Sulpitius* ["*Ac mea*

 "*quidem*

" *quidem ſententia eſt, mihi tam reos quam accuſatores diſplicere.*
" *Certe Ithacium nihil penſi, nihil ſancti habuiſſe definio: fuit enim*
" *audax, loquax, impudens, ſumptuoſus, ventri & gulæ plurimum*
" *impertiens. Hic ſtultitiæ eo uſque proceſſerat ut omnes etiam*
" *ſanctos viros, quibus aut ſtudium erat lectionis, aut propoſitum*
" *erat certare jejuniis, tanquam Priſcilliani ſocios aut diſcipulos in*
" *crimen arceſſeret. Auſus etiam miſer eſt ea tempeſtate Martino*
" *Epiſcopo---palam objectare hæreſis infamiam. Imperator per*
" *Magnum & Rufum Epiſcopos depravatus à mitioribus conſiliis de-*
" *flexus* --So he tells how many were put to death---*Cæterum*
" *Priſcilliano occiſo, non ſolum non repreſſa eſt hæreſis-- ſed confir-*
" *mata, latius propagata eſt: Namque ſectatores ejus qui eum*
" *prius ut ſanctum honoraverant, poſtea ut Martyrem colere cœpe-*
" *runt. Ac inter noſtros perpetuum diſcordiarum bellum exarſerat,*
" *quod jam per quindecim annos fœdis diſſenſionibus agitatum,*
" *nullo modo ſopiri poterat. Et nunc cum maxime diſcordiis Epiſ-*
"*coporum turbari aut miſceri omnia cernerentur, cunctaque per eos*
" *odio aut gratia, metu, inconſtantia, invidia, factione, libidine,*
" *avaritia, arrogantia, ſomno, deſidia, eſſent depravata: Poſtremo*
" *plures adverſus paucos bene conſulentes, inſanis conſiliis & perti-*
" *nacibus ſtudiis certarent: Inter hæc Plebs Dei, & Optimus quiſ-*
" *que probro atque ludibrio habebatur.*] So ends *Sulpitius* Hiſtory.

Do you not ſee, Mr. *Morrice*, that there have been Prelates and Puritanes, even Epiſcopal Puritanes before our Times? Doth not your ſtomach riſe againſt *Sulpitius* as too Puritanical and ſevere? Is not my Language of moſt of the Biſhops ſoft in compariſon of his? Yet he was ſo early as to live in that which you now call the moſt flouriſhing Time of the Church. Sir, I hate Diſcord, and love Peace; but I never look that the Enmity between the Woman's and the Serpent's Seed, or *Cain* and *Abel*, ſhould be ended; or that the holy Title of Biſhops and Prieſts ſhould reconcile ungodly men to Saints. Sir, *England* knoweth, that though ſome factious perſons have done otherwiſe, the main Body of thoſe that your Law doth Silence, Ruine and Revile, have a high eſteem of ſuch Biſhops as have been ſeriouſly godly; ſuch as were many in Antient and late Times: And deride it as long as you will, the ſeriouſly religious People in *England* are they that are moſt againſt Church-Tyranny, and which Party moſt of the debauched and prophane are of, hath long been known.

§ 9. But

§ 9. But the Reader shall further hear how little you are to be trusted. Saith *Sul. in Vita Mart.* [*Apud Nemausum Episcoporum Synodus habebatur ad quam quidem ire noluerat*---(There's another Synod.)

Et pag. 584. In *Mon. Pat.* [" *Maximus Imperator alias vir* " *bonus, depravatus consiliis Sacerdotum, post Priscilliani necem* " *Ithacium Episcopum Priscilliani accusatorem cæteroſq; illius socios,* " *quos nominare non est necesse vi regia tuebatur.---Congregati apud* " *Treveros Episcopi* (there's another Synod) *tenebantur, qui quotidie* " *communicantes Ithacio communem sibi causam fecerant: His ubi* " *nunciatum est inopinantibus, adesse Martinum, totis animis la-* " *befacti, mussitare & trepidare cœperunt.---Nec dubium erat quin* " *Sanctorum etiam maximam turbam tempestas ista depopulatura* " *esset. Etenim tunc solis oculis discernunt inter hominum genera,* " *cum quis Pallore potius aut Veste, quam fide, hæreticus æstimare-* " *tur. Hæc nequaquam placitura Martino Episcopi faciebant.---* " *Ineunt cum Imperatore Consilium ut missis obviam Magistri of-* " *ficialibus, urbem istam (Martinus) vetaretur propius accedere.* (But it was not five Miles from all Cities and Corporations.)--- " *Interea Episcopi quorum communionem Martinus non inibat tre-* " *pidi ad Regem concurrunt, per damnatos se conquerentes actum* " *esse de suo omnium statu, si Theognisti pertinaciam, qui eos SO-* " *LUS palam lata sententia condemnaverat, Martini armaret au-* " *thoritas: Non oportuisse hominem capi mœnibus illis: Non jam* " *defensorem hæreticorum esse, sed vindicem* (Methinks I read Mr. " *Morrice*) *Nihil actum morte Priscilliani si Martinus exerceat* " *illius ultionem.* (These men have done nothing till they " have destroy'd all that are against their Tyranny.) *Postremo* " *prostrati cum fletu* (they could weep too) *& lamentatione Po-* " *testatem Regiam implorant, ut utatur adversus UNUM homi-* " *nem vi sua: Nec multum aberat quin cogeretur Imperator Mar-* " *tinum cum hæreticorum sorte miscere.*] But the Emperour know- " ing his eminent Holiness and Reputation, tryeth persuasion; " [*& blande appellat, hæreticos jure damnatos, more judiciorum* " *publicorum, potius quam in sectationibus Sacerdotum: Non esse* " *causam qua Ithacii cæterorumq; partis ejus communionem, puta-* " *ret esse damnandam, Theognistum odio potius quam causa, feciſſe* " *dissidium; Eundemq; tamen SOLUM esse qui se à communione* " *interim separavit; a reliquis nihil novatum.*] You see here that " M. *M.* saith truly, that *Martin* separated but from the Bishops " of

" of *Ithacius*'s Party: That is, All ſave one *Theogniſtus* (and " *Igninus* is elſewhere named.) Is not here a great accord of the Biſhops?) [" *Quinetiam paucos ante dies habita Synodus* (Sy- " nods ſtill) *Ithacium pronunciaverat culpa non teneri*] no won- " der: Synods have juſtified the forbidding of two thouſand to " Preach the Goſpel.) At laſt when no other Remedy could " ſave the Lives of men from the Leeches, *Martin* yielded once " to communicate with the Biſhops on condition the mens " Lives ſhould be ſaved: The Biſhops would have had him " *Subſcribe* this Communion: But that he would never do. [*Po-* " *ſterodie inde ſe proripiens, cum revertens in viam mœſtus ingemiſce-* " *ret, ſe vel ad horam noxiæ communioni eſſe permixtum---ſub-* " *ſedit, cauſam doloris & facti accuſante & defendente cogitatione* " *pervolvens, aſtitit ei repente Angelus*; Merito inquit Martine " *compungeris, ſed aliter exire nequiſti: Repara virtutem: reſume* " *Conſtantiam; ne jam non periculum gloriæ, ſed ſalutis incur-* " *reris. Itaque ab illo tempore ſatis cavit, cum illa Ithacianæ* " *partis communione miſceri. Cæterum cum quoſdam ex inergu-* " *menis, tardius quam ſolebat, & gratia minore curabat, ſubinde* " *nobis cum lachrymis fatebatur, ſe propter communionis illius ma-* " *lum cui ſe vel paucto temporis neceſſitate, non ſpiritu miſcuiſſet, de-* " *trimentum ſentire virtutis. Sedecim poſtea vixit annos: Nul-* " *lam Synodum adiit; ab omnibus Conventibus ſe removit.*] Now Reader, judge how great *Ithacius*'s Party was, that boaſted but one or two men were againſt them: And whether *Martin* ſeparated not from their common Synods.

Methinks I ſee Mr. *M.* here in the ſtrait of the Phariſees, when put to anſwer whether *John*'s Baptiſm was from Heaven, or of men. Fain he would make *Martin* and *Sulpitius* Puritanes and Fanaticks; but the Church hath made a Holy day for *Martin*, and dedicated multitudes of Temples to his Honour; and all men reverence *Sulpitius* and him. Yet he ventures to go as far as he durſt *p.* 142. againſt them.

§ 10. But here Mr. *M.* ſmarteth, and ſaith [*This Inſtance could become none worſe than Mr.* B. *who in a Letter to Dr.* Hill *confeſſes himſelf to have been a Man of Blood*--]

Anſw. A *Man of Blood* is your Libertine Phraſe. If you would have publiſhed that ſecret Letter, you ſhould 1. Have told the whole, and worded it truly; 2. And have profeſſed your ſelf a derider of Repentance, while you call for it. I lived in an Age of

of War, and I was on the Parliaments ſide, and that was enough to prove that I had a hand in blood while I was on one ſide, though I never drew blood of any man my ſelf (ſave once a Boy at School with boxing.)

But he thinks I ſhould have imitated *Martin* in renouncing Communion with men of blood.

Anſw. *Martin* renounced Communion with thoſe that were for deſtroying even downright Hereticks. Alas Sir, I dare not renounce Communion with theſe that Silence thouſands of faithful Miniſters, and continue ſtill to Plead, Preach, and Write for their Proſecution by Impriſonment and Ruine. I hope many do it in Ignorance, and if I do it, it may increaſe the diſtance that I would heal. Nonconformiſts are no Priſcillianiſts.

And if I renounce Communion with all that were in Wars, it muſt be with ſome preſent Biſhops, and a great part of the Land.

But I underſtand you; it muſt be with all that were in Arms for the Parliament, *&c.* *Anſw.* The King then will condemn me by his Act of Oblivion, and by his own practice: Hath he not one of them for the Lord Preſident of his Council? and many more in Truſt and Honour? Did he renounce Communion with General *Monk* and his whole Army, who were long in Arms for the Parliament? Or with the Citizens, and multitudes of Commanders through the Land, who drew in & encouraged General *Monk*? Or the Miniſters that perſuaded Sir *Tho. Allen*, Lord Mayor, to draw him in?

To be plain with you Sir (though you call it Railing) Men of your Faculty kindled the Fire, and ſet the Nation together by the Ears, and when ſad experience brought them to repentance and to deſire unity and peace, and thoſe that had fought for the Parliament had reſtored the King, this evil Spirit envyeth the Kingdom the benefit of this concord, and would fain break us again into contending Parties, and will not let King and Kingdom have peace, while God giveth us peace from all foreign enemies. Do we need any other notice what a Contentious Clergy have ſtill been, than the woful experience of what they are. If you would have had *G. Monk* and his Army, and all ſuch that joyned with him deſtroyed or excommunicate for what they had done, why did you not ſpeak out at firſt, but when we would all fain have peace and concord thus twenty years after caſt your Wild-

fire

fire you warn the Preſent Duke of *Albemarle* to expect to be at laſt called to account for his original ſin.

§ 11. But his paſſion makes him ſay he knows not what, P. 142 [" I need not call Mr. *B.* to remembrance who compared " *Cromwel* to *David* and his Son to *Solomon*; But this has tran- " ſported me a little too far.]

Anſ. He ſaith this plainly of me afterward, to ſhew the credibility of his Hiſtory? Did he know it to be falſe? If ſo, there's no diſputing with him. If not, why did he not cite my words. Yea he after tranſcribes the Epiſtle meant, where he ſaw there were no ſuch words: But others had told that tale before him, and that was Enough: Even as one of his tribe hath written that I have written in my Holy Common-wealth, that *any one Peer may judge the King.* If theſe Epiſcopal Hiſtorians tell forreigners that we have all Cloven Feet and Horns, and go on four legs, yea and if ſome ſwear it, we have no remedy: They can prove our noſes horns, and our hands Feet.

I again tell them, If *Martins* Angel and Miracles be credible, woe to thoſe Prelatiſts that are for ruining violence, and ſilences againſt men better than the *Gnoſticks.* If they be not true, let them not truſt too much to the beſt Hiſtorians.

§ 12. Of the Council at *Capua* I ſaid that they decreed that the two Biſhops and their People *ſhould live* in loving Communion, Mr. *M.* finds me miſtaken here. The words in *Binnius* are [*Ut tam Flaviani quam Evagrii fautores in Communionem Catholicam admittantur, modo Catholicæ fidei aſſertores inveniantur*] I thought Catholick Communion had been *Loving Communion*: And I thought if their fautors were to be received, ſo were they: And I thought *Antioch* had been a part of the Catholick Church, and Catholick Communion had extended to *Antioch*: But if Mr. M. deny theſe, I will not contend with him.

§ 13. He tells us, that [*No man with his Eyes open ever ſaw the Condemnation of* Bonoſus *by the Council of* Capua] (for denying the Virgin Mary's perpetual Virginity.

Anſw. It is Criticiſm and not Hiſtory that the man is beſt at. They did it mediately, while they referred it to them that did it. Saith *Binnius* [" *Cauſa Bonoſi cujuſdam in* Macedonia *Epiſco-* " *pi hæretici, negantis delibatam Dei genitricis Mariæ Virginita-* " *tem, poſt partum in judicium deducta eſt. Synodus cognitionem* " *cauſæ Anyſio Theſſalonienſi cum Epiſcopis ipſi ſubjectis delegavit.*

" *Ab*

" *Ab Anysio Bonosum damnatum, eorumque quos ordinasset commu-*
" *nione privatum esse testatur Innoc. P.* And he knows it's a Heresie now. Yet this Council condemned Reordinations.

§ 14. That *Jovinian* a Monk was called a Heretick, for Doctrines judged sound by Protestants, is no strange thing. That one not a Bishop was the Head of a Heresie, was somewhat strange then, but not before they got too high.

As to the Question, Whether Bishops were the Chief Heads and Fomenters of Heresie, I crave his impartial Answer to these Questions. 1. Do not your selves maintain that all Churches in the world had Bishops; and that the Bishops were the Rulers, and of Chief Power? If so, can you imagine that after they had such Power, Churches could be usually made Hereticks without them?

Q. 2. Do not Councils, and all Church-History tell us how many Councils of Hereticks there have been that were Bishops?

Q. 3. If any Presbyter broke from his Bishop to set up a Heresie, was it not one that sought to be a Bishop? Or did they not make presently him or some other their Bishop and Head? Heresie or Popery had made but small progress, had it not been for Bishops.

§ 15. When I commend the *Novatians* Canon, which allowed all men Liberty for the Time of *Easter*, as better than burning men as Hereticks, he takes it for an *Immoderate Transport* that I say [" *as loud as I can speak, If all the Proud, Ambitious,* " *Hereticating part of the Bishops had been of this mind, O what* " *sin, what scandal, and what shame, what cruelties, confusions and* " *miseries had the Christian world escaped?*] That is, had they left such Indifferent things as Indifferent.

And is this against Moderation? I would such Zeal of God's House had more eaten me up: Dare you deny but that this course would have saved the Lives of all those thousands of *Albigenses, Waldenses,* and *Bohemians* that the Papists killed: And the death and torment of multitudes by the Inquisition? And the burning of our *Smithfield* Martyrs: And it's like most of the Wars between the Old Popes and Emperours about Investitures? And the blood of many thousand more. And it would have saved more Nations than ours from the Tearing and Division of Churches by the Ejecting and Silencing of hundreds or thousands of their Pastors, as the case of the *Germane Interim,* and other

such actions prove. And is it *Immoderate Transport* to wish all this Blood, Schism, Hatred and Confusion, and weakning and shaming of the Church had been prevented at the rate of *Tolerating Indifferent things:* No wonder if you had rather *England* still suffered what it doth, and is in danger of by Schism, than such things Indifferent shall be tolerated: It is not for nothing that Christ and *Paul* repeat, that some *have Eyes and see not, Ears and hear not*, &c.

§ 16. And here he again would make his Reader think it's true, that the Nonconformists pretend that their Silencing is for not keeping *Easter* Day at the due Time; as if this man that liveth among us did not know, that it is the *avoiding of deliberate Lying by subscribing to a known untruth*, which is the thing that they refuse; and they mention it only as an appurtenance of the Imposition *ad homines*, that it would bind them to *two different times*.

Whether, as he saith, *our disease be a wantonness fed by concession, and we are most violent when we know not what we would have*, those men are no credible Judges that for seventeen years would not endure us to speak out our Case; and when before we debated part of it, would not vouchsafe to answer us; and at last when we tell it them, do but accuse us with a sharper storm, instead of giving any thing that a man can call an Answer that ever knew the Case, *e.g.* to our *Pleas for Peace*, and my *Treatise of Episcopacy*.

§ 17. He confesseth that I praise the *African* Bishops as the best in the world, though it contradict his former charge. As to the Magnitude of Dioceses, when he hath answered my Treat. of Episcopacy, some body may be edified by him.

I agree with him that *Good men will do much Good in a great Diocess*. But 1. Worldly Bishops are so far bad: And worldly Wealth and Honour will ever be most sought by the most worldly men: And usually he that seeks shall find---*Ergo*---And 2. A good man cannot do Impossibilities: The best cannot do the work of many hundred.

Forty two years ago some wisht for the Restoring of Confession.

Theophilus Parochialis brings copious Reasons and Orders of Princes, Popes and Prelates, that all should confess to the Parish-Priest. If you had set this up here, how many men must have gone

gone to it in the Pariſhes of St. *Martin, Giles Cripplegate, Stepney*, &c? But how much greater work hath Dr. *Hammond*, and Old Councils, cut out for him that will be the ſole Biſhop of many hundred Pariſhes? I have named it elſewhere.

And, if any man of conſideration think I have not proved againſt Mr. *Dodwell*, that Biſhops Government is not like a King's, who may make what Officers under him he pleaſe, but depends more as a Phyſician's or School-maſter's on *Perſonal Ability*, I will now add but this Queſtion to him [*Why is it that Monarchy may be hereditary, and a Child or Infant may be King*] *but an Infant may not be Biſhop, nor any one not qualified with Eſſential Ability?* I have at large told you how ſharply *Baronius* and *Binnius* condemn that odious Nullity of making a Child (by his Father's Power) A. Biſhop of *Rhemes*.

If I heard twenty men ſay and ſwear that one man is ſufficient to be the only Maſter of many hundred Schools, or Phyſician to many hundred Hoſpitals, or that one Carpenter or Maſon may alone build and rear all the Houſes in the City after the Fire, or one man be the ſole Maſter of an hundred thouſand Families; what can I ſay to him, but that he never tryed or knows the work?

§ 18. When I note that the *Donatiſts* took themſelves for the Catholicks, and the Adverſaries for Schiſmaticks, becauſe they were the greater number, he very honeſtly ſaith, that *Multitude may render a Sect formidable, but it's no Argument of Right*.

Very true; nor Secular Power neither. But what better Argument have the Papiſts, and many others that talk againſt Schiſm?

§ 19. He thinks the *Donatiſts Biſhops Churches were not ſo ſmall as our Pariſhes. Anſw.* Not as ſome: But if, as I ſaid before, *Conſtantinople* in the height of all it's Glory in *Chryſoſtom*'s daies, had but 100000 Chriſtians, as many as three *London*-Pariſhes have, judge then what the *Donatiſts* had.

§ 20. His double quarrel with *Binnius* and *Baronius*, let who will mind. What I gathered out of thoſe and other Canons of the ſmalneſs of Churches then, I have elſewhere made good: His Reviling Accuſations of *Envy* to their Wealth, deſerveth no Anſwer.

§ 21. He comes to St. *Theophilus*'s Caſe, of which we ſpake

before. The Monks that reported evil of him, *were, it may be,* ſaith he, *downright Knaves,* The Reviling is blameleſs when applied to ſuch. Doubtleſs they were ignorant raſh Zealots: But one that reads what the *Egyptian* Monks were in *Anthony's* daies, and after, and what Miracles and Holineſs, *Sulpitius Severus* reporteth of them, and why *Baſil* retired into his Monaſtery, *&c.* may conjecture that they had much leſs worldlineſs than the Biſhops, and not greater faults.

§ 22. I think it not deſirable or pleaſant work to vindicate the credit of *Socrates* and *Sozomen* accuſing *Theophilus*: But if his Conjectures in this caſe may ſerve againſt expreſs Hiſtory of ſuch men, and ſo near, let him leave other Hiſtories as looſe to our Conjectures. *Poſthumianus* Narrative in *Sulpitius*, is but of one piece of the Tragedy. He thinks it improbable that *Origen* ſhould be accuſed for making God *Incorporeal*; and ſuch Conjectures are his Confutation of Hiſtory: But *Origen* had two ſort of Accuſers; the Biſhops, ſuch as *Theophilus* and *Epiphanius* had worſe charges againſt him: But the *Anthropomorphite* Monks were they that brought that Charge againſt him (that God had no face, hands, eyes.) And *Theophilus* before them cryed down *Origen* in general, to ſave his life, by deceiving them, that they might think he did it on the ſame account as they did. This is *Socrates* his Report of the Caſe.

He ſaith, that *the Impudent Mutinous Monks were not aſhamed to tell all the world, that all that were againſt them were Anthropophites.*

Anſw. It was other Monks that I here talk not of, that he means: It was theſe Monks that were *Anthropomorphites* themſelves, and would have killed *Theophilus* for not being ſo, till he ſaid to them, *Methinks I ſee your faces as the Face of God*: And the name of the Face of God did quiet them. *Hierom* was a Party againſt *Chryſoſtom*; it was for not paſſing that Sentence on *Origen*, that *Epiphanius* would by maſterly Uſurpation have impoſed on him, that *Chryſoſtom* was by him accuſed.

§ 23. Could any Sobriety excuſe that man *Epiphanius*, that would come to the Imperial City, and there purpoſely intrude into the Cathedral of one of the beſt Biſhops in the world, for Parts and Piety, and there play the Biſhop over an A. Biſhop in his own Church, and ſeek to ſet all the Auditory in a flame at the time of Publick Worſhip, and require him to ſay that of *Origen*,

Origen, which he there without any Authority impoſed on him? I know not what is Pride, Uſurpation, Turbulency, if not Malignity, if this be not.

But at laſt he ſaith, ["*I do not intend to excuſe* Theophilus *in* "*this particular*: (*Thank Pope* Innocent) *He did certainly pro-* "*ſecute his Reſentment too far*: *But he was not the only man*: " Epiphanius, *a perſon of great Holineſs*; Hierom, *and ſeveral* "*other perſons renowned for their Piety, were concerned in the per-* "*ſecution of this Great man, as well as he*: *And to ſay the truth,* "*this is their weakneſs*; *for that Severity which gives men gene-* "*rally a Reputation of Holineſs, though it mortifie ſome irregular* "*heats, yet is apt to diſpoſe men to previſhneſs.*]

But true Holineſs ever ſincerely loveth holy men, and ſpecially ſuch as are publick Bleſſings to the Church: And though I cenſure not their main State, your *Holy Perſecutors* of the beſt of Chriſt's Servants, will never by Chriſt be judged ſmall Offenders.

Alas! it's too true that *Theophilus* was not alone: A Council of Biſhops were the Perſecutors. And it's hard to think that they loved *Chryſoſtom* as themſelves. When the forementioned Council at *Conſtantinople* had turned out *Nazianzen*, even the great magnifiers of General Councils, *Baronius* and *Binnius*, thus reproach them, that they *drove away a holy excellent man, that a man was ſet up in his ſtead that was no Chriſtian; that it was the* Epiſcopi Nundinarii *that did it, the Oriental Biſhops firſt leaving them, and going away with* Gregory. And if the *Major* Vote of that General Council were *Epiſcopi Nundinarii*, what *Chryſoſtom*'s Perſecutors were may be conjectured. Do not theſe Papiſts here ſay worſe of them than I do?

§ 24. Yet though he confeſs as much as is aforeſaid, and bring but his Conjectures mixt with palpable omiſſions againſt the expreſs words of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, he hath the face to make up his failing with this Calumny ["*I have dwelt ſo long on* "*this, not only to vindicate* Theophilus, *but to ſhew once for all the* "*manner of our Author's dealing with his Reader in his Church-* "*Hiſtory. Any ſcandalous Story, though it be as falſe and impro-* "*bable as any in the* Anni Mirabiles, *or* Whites Centuries *of Scan-* "*dalous Miniſters, any Fiction that reflects with diſgrace on* "*Biſhops and Councils is ſet down for authentick, no matter who* "*delivers it, friend or foe.*]

Anſw.

Answ. Are not *Baronius* and *Binnius* friends to the higheſt Prelacy? Doth not he himſelf ſay that *Socrates is a credible Hiſtorian?* Is his Authority weighty enough to diſcredit them whom he contradicts? Hath he proved one word falſe that I have ſaid of *Theophilus*? Is not *Chryſoſtom* as credible as he? Doth he not know how ill he is ſpoken of by a great number of *Chryſoſtom's* Defenders? And how ſmartly *Iſidore Peluſiota* reflects on him?

But who could have diſgraced him more, than he that will imply that the things mentioned of him are as true as what is ſaid in *White's Centuries of Scandalous Miniſters*, or the *Anni Mirabiles*. I know not all or moſt things in either of them. But he was a ſtranger in *England* that had not credible Teſtimony of divers of the things in the *Anni Mirabiles*. And Mr. *White*, the Chairman of that Parliament-Committee, was commonly reputed a grave and godly credible man; and if he lied, the whole Committee muſt concur in the Lie; and the Witneſſes muſt all be falſe. I will not further meddle in ſo unpleaſant a buſineſs, than to tell you, that all that I knew accuſed of Scandal, had Witneſſes of it, that in the places where they lived were thought to make as much conſcience of a Lie, as the beſt of their Neighbours: And whether ſuch a mans ſcorn that was then in the ſhell, is in Hiſtory a ſufficient proof that Committees of Parliament, and Witneſſes, were all Lyars, I leave to conſideration, I well know what School-maſters and Curates I was bred under, and what the two Miniſters were that were ſequeſtred in the place where I after came: And all the Country can tell you. They conſtrained me to name them, and the Caſe in my Apology for our Preaching, and my Anſwer to Mr. *Hinkley*: It's yet the ſame Age: Any may enquire of them.

§ 25. As to his Note of *Altars*, I doubt not but there were at the Memorials of Martyrs *Commemoratory Altars* erected in the third or fourth Centuries: But what's that to *Communicatory Altars*? and thoſe in the firſt and ſecond Century?

§ 26. I ſuppoſe he wrote againſt my Book upon ſome others Reading. I did in a Parentheſis ſay (*Innocent* Excommunicated *Theophilus*, *Arcadius* and the Empreſs.) And of another matter added; *yet did this paſs without contradiction*: And he confounds them, and ſaith, [*Any thing paſſeth with him for Hiſtory: This Epiſtle of* Innocent *is all forged.*] *Anſw.* I ſee not his proof: But I had

I had rather it were proved false than true: But when I speak against Papal Usurpation (be the men never so good) I think to such *Binnius* and *Baronius* are meet Witnesses.

§ 27. *Boniface*'s Decree of exempting Bishops from Civil Judicatures, he thinks not so Antient, and saith, We have only the Authority of *Gratian* for it: But his Conjecture and a flirt at me is all the Confutation: And he cannot doubt but that Exemption hath sufficiently priviledged Bishops since then: As is after proved.

CHAP. XXI.

Of the first Council of Ephesus, *&c. His Cap.* 5.

§ 1. OUR Accuser in his Fifth Chapter passeth by the just Praises which I give to Peaceable Bishops, as crossing his Slander that I dispraise all, or such as well as the unpeaceable, whose Justification it is that he undertaketh.

§ 2. He begins with an Accusation, that [*to prejudice the Reader against* Cyril's *Council, I give the worst account of him that I could patch up out of all the Libels and Accusations of his Enemies.*]

Answ. If by *Prejudice* be meant *Informing him of History*; and by *Worst* is meant *Impartial Recitation* of what History saith; and by *Patching up* be meant such *Reciting*; and by *Enemies* be meant the *best and most credible Historians* that have written of it, then this is true: Else it is the work of that Undertaker that is engaged to call *Evil Good*, and *Darkness Light*, and preferreth speaking good of bad actions, before speaking truly.

§ 3. And that you may know by what Spirit men that will not reproach the best that differ from the Prelates, are themselves reproached by this Sect, and also what sort of History this man giveth the Lie to, on pretence of giving it me, and how far he is from Railing, he thus proceedeth.

["The first thing he is charged with is the Oppression of the "*Novatians*. This was enough with *Socrates* or *Sozomen* to "paint him as ugly as men do the Devil or Antichrist; and "there-

" therefore there is no great credit to be given them in theſe " Relations, as manifeſtly eſpouſing the Cauſe and Quarrel of " the *Novatians.*]

Anſw. 1. Juſt as *Thuanus* or *Eraſmus* eſpouſed the Cauſe of the Proteſtants by Truth and Peace, when others hated and belied them. 2. Methinks the man revileth me very gently in compariſon of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, the two moſt impartial and credible of all our Antient Church-Hiſtorians (with *Theodorot.*) But who can wonder that he imitateth that which he defendeth.

§ 4. But he ſaith, [*It may be the* Novatians *deſerved it--- and it's not unlikely that they were very troubleſom and ſeditions.*]

Anſw. It's *not unlikely* now that others will ſay it was ſo. But mark Reader which of theſe Hiſtorians is moſt credible [*Socrates* and *Sozomen* lived with thoſe that knew the things and perſons: They have told us Truth in the reſt of their Hiſtories: If they had been *Novatians*, Mr. *M.* ſaith, They believed ſinning after Baptiſm had no pardon or abſolution: And were they not like then to fear ſuch Lying and falſe Accuſing as paints a Saint like the Devil or Antichriſt.] On the other ſide [Mr. *M.* liveth above a thouſand years after them: He is one of the Party that take it to be not only lawful, but a duty to ſay and ſwear all that is impoſed now, which I will not here deſcribe: How truly he writes the Hiſtory of his own Age, even of Parliament and Wars, and living perſons, I have told you. He ſaith no more againſt the Hiſtorians credit here, but [*it may be*] and [*it's not unlikely*] and [*they were* Novatians, Schiſmaticks, Alexandrians.] Even ſo their Counterminer, and many Conformiſts, that have many years reported us to be Raiſing a War againſt the King, bad their [*May-be's*] and [*It's not unlikely*] and [*they are Schiſmaticks*] *to prove it:* And others ſoon roſe up and ſwore it. And when ſome lament their Perjury, it ſtops not the reſt. But ſome have ſuch *Free-will*, that they can believe whom they liſt.

§ 5. *Socrates*, ſaith he, *makes it part of his charge that he took on him the Government of temporal Affairs. This was not the Uſurpation of the Biſcop, but the Indulgence of the Emperour*: And he ſhews the Churches need of it.

Anſw. That which he is charged with is, that *he was the firſt Biſcop that himſelf uſed the Sword.* And 1. Do you think that ſo great a Patriarchate & Dioceſs would not find a conſcionable

nable Paſtor work enough, without joyning with it the Magiſtrates Office? 2. Was not the Church greatly changed even ſo early from what it was a little before in the daies of *Martin* and *Sulpitius*, when even *Ithacius* durſt not own being ſo much as a ſeeker to the Magiſtrate to draw the Sword againſt groſs Hereticks; and the beſt Biſhops denied Communion with them that ſought it: And now a Biſhop himſelf becomes the ſtriker not of groſs Hereticks, but ſuch as peaceable Biſhops bore with.

I remember not to have read that *Cyril* had any Commiſſion for the Sword from the Emperour: Others then had not: But I deny it not.

§ 6. He ſaith, that elſewhere I ſay [*I ſhall not diſhonour ſuch, nor diſobey them.*] *Anſw.* I ſay and do ſo: If a Biſhop will take another Calling from the King's Grant, when he hath undertaken already 40 times more work as a Dioceſan than he can do, Ile honour and obey him as a Magiſtrate: But I would be loth to ſtand before God under the guilt of his undertaking and omiſſions.

§ 7. As to all the reſt of the Hiſtory about *Cyril*'s Executions, and the wounding of *Oreſtes* the Governour, I leave it between the Credit of Mr. *M.* and *Socrates.*: And *he very much ſuſpects the Story of* Cyril's *making a Martyr of him that was executed for it*: I leave all to the Reader's Judgment. I think I may tranſcribe *Socrates* without ſlandering *Cyril.*

Here his ſpleen riſing, ſaith [*There are men in the world that honour ſuch as Martyrs for murdering a King.*]

Anſw. You may ſmell what he inſinuates: I think he will not ſay, that he ever did more againſt them than thoſe that they call Presbyterians have done. We Wrote and Preacht againſt them when he did not. I know not the Presbyterian living to my remembrance, that was not againſt the Murder of the King, and *Prin*, whom the Biſhops had cropt and ſtigmatized for being againſt them, as an *Eraſtian*, was the hotteſt in the Parliament, for the Execution of the King's Judges: But I knew divers Conformiſts that have written or ſpoken to juſtifie or excuſe that Fact.

§ 8. As for the Murder of *Hypatia*, I leave him to his ſcuffle with *Socrates* and *Damaſcius*, in which I intereſs not my ſelf.

§ 9. I thank Pope *Innocent* Mr. *M.* durſt not deny *Cyril*'s

faults, in his Enmity to the memory of *Chryſoſtom*; and yet he calls my reciting the matter of Fact a *reproach*. He is conſtrained to confeſs ["*That the Quarrel was it ſeems hereditary to him* " (ſo is Original Sin) *and he did proſecute it beyond all equity or* " *decency againſt the memory of a dead man: This was a fault, and* " *and he that is without any, or without any particular animoſity,* " *ſpecially if he be in any eminent place, let him caſt the firſt ſtone.*]

Anſw. Thanks to Conſcience: We feel your Animoſities: But is not this man a Railing Accuſer of *Cyril*, if I am ſuch? What ſaith he leſs in the main? Yea he now renews his Accuſation of his Predeceſſor, ſaying, *It was hereditary*. To proſecute malice againſt the very name of a holy extraordinary Biſhop, beyond *all equity and decency*—what will Chriſtianity or Humanity call it? But Faction ſaith, *it was a fault, and he that is without any*, &c. Thus talkt *Eli* to his Sons: So one may ſay, To Silence 2000 Miniſters, or to hate the beſt men, and ſeek their ruine, is *a fault*, a Prelatical peccadillo; and ſo was *Bonner*'s uſage of the Martyrs; and let him that is without any caſt the firſt ſtone. And St. *John* ſaith, *He that hateth his Brother is a murderer*, and none ſuch hath Eternal Life abiding in him; and that as *Cain*, he is of the Evil One, the Devil. And I believe him.

§ 10. But he ſaith, *I injuriouſly charge him with calling* Alexander *a bold faced man, when* Atticus *was the firſt Author of that word.*

Anſw. Atticus mentioned *Alexander*'s confident, true and neceſſary Counſel; *Cyril* contradicting it, calls the man, *A man of a confident face or mouth*. If another Biſhop ſaid the firſt words before him, do I wrong him in ſaying he ſaid the *ſecond?* O tender men! His urging the keeping up the names of ſuch as *Nectarius* and *Arſacius*, and caſting out *Chryſoſtomus*, is ſo like our Canons about Readers and Nonconformiſts, and our Canoneers deſcriptions of their Country Parſons, and the Puritanes, that I wonder not that you defend him.

§ 11. But he ſaith, that *It's a little unchriſtian to blaſt his memory with the faults which he corrected in his life-time.*]

Anſw. 1. It's neceſſary to tell that truth which blaſteth the Reputation of ſuch ſin as was growing up towards Papacy. *Anſ.* 2. Then Chriſt was unchriſtian to tell the Jews of their very Fathers murders of the Prophets, while they diſclaimed it, and built their Sepulchres, *Mat.* 23. And then it was unchriſtian in the

the Holy Ghoſt, to blaſt the memory of *Adam*, *Noe*, *Lot*, *David* *Solomon*, *Peter*, yea or *Manaſſeh*, with ſins repented of. 3. Hiſtory muſt ſpeak truth about things *repented* of; or elſe it will but deceive the world. 4. The Honour of God, and Goodneſs, and Truth, muſt be preferred before our own Honour. Repentance, if true, will moſt freely confeſs a mans own ſin, and moſt fully ſhame it.

§ 12. Whether all his far-fetcht Conjectures that *Cyril* repented, be true or no, is nothing to me. I will hope he did, though I never ſaw it proved: The very laſt Sentence of Death might do it. His retortion is, [*I know no man deeper engaged in the Contentions of the Church* (than I) *The writing of his Eighty Books being but like ſo many pitcht Battels he has fought, and moſt commonly in the dark, when he was hardly able to diſcover friend from foe.*]

Anſw. It's too true, that being all written for Peace, the Enemies of Peace have fought againſt them. *Nimis diu habitavit, anima mea inter oſores pacis.* But *pro captu Lectoris*, &c. All men take not the words of ſuch as he for Oracles. How much I have written and done for Peace, let others read and judge. I long laboured and begg'd for Peace in vain with ſuch as he defendeth. And it's admirable if this pittileſs Enemy of Sects and Errours can be for all the Sects and Errours that I have written againſt. Have I in the dark taken for foes by Errour the Atheiſts, the Infidels, the Sadducees, the Hobbiſts, the Quakers, the Ranters, the Papiſts, the Socinians, the Libertines called Antinomians, the Anabaptiſts, the Separatiſts, and Sects as Sects? Be of good comfort all: Theſe Prelatiſts that accuſe us for too dark and ſharp Writings againſt you, ſeem to tell you that they will more hate perſecuting or diſtreſſing you; Yes when they agree with themſelves.

His Prayer that I may have a more *honorable* opinion of Repentance he calls me to ſpeak to in the End.

§ 13. Whether good *Iſidore Peluſiota* were a man [*"very "eaſy to take any impreſſions, and upon falſe information chargeth "Cyril with proſecuting his private quarrells with* Neſtorius *"under pretence of zeal for the faith*] I leave all men to believe our Accuſer as they ſee cauſe. And the ſame I ſay of that which is ſo great a Controverſie among the Critical Hiſtorians, whether *Theodorets* Epiſtle to *Joh. Ant.* againſt *Cyril* be Counterfeit, or

were written on a falſe rumour of *Cyrils* death. Their 5th General Council hath it. *Baronius* and *Binnius* ſay, ſome *Eutychian* knave hath corrupted the Acts of that Council. Muſt Councils be the Laws of all the world, and hath the Church and *Tradition* kept them no better, that we know not when we have them truly? Leave us then to the univerſal Laws of God.

§ 14. He ſaith truly that [*the Council of* Epheſus *was chiefly directed by the authority of* Cyril] *Anſ.* And ſo was that at *Trent* by the authority of the Pope And when he hath confuted the credible Hiſtory wich tells us of the womens and Courtiers hatred of *Neſtorius*, and proved that the Emperour and *Pulcheria* the Empreſs were but one, I will grant that the *authority of the Court directed not Cyril*; and that then and now Biſhops neither were nor are directed by the Civil powers.

§ 15. When I ſpake againſt *Neſtorius* his cruelty to Sectaries he asketh [*What Hereticaters were hotter than the Preſbyterians in* 1646. *The Inquiſition is not more ſevere than their ordinance againſt Hereſies, which they deſired ſhould be made felony and puniſhed by death &c.*]

Anſ. Reader Judge of the mans Credit as to ancient Hiſtory ſtill by his truth about the Preſent age. 1. The *Inquiſition* he ſaith, *is not more ſevere.* Do I need to anſwer this to any man of 50 years of age? It's Capable of no anſwer but what he will call by ſome name deſerved by his own.

2. I can find no ſuch ordinance: He ſaith It *was offered*? Is that all? And by whom? Was it the body of the Presbterians, or who?

3. What were the Hereſies named by them? Were they not down right Blaſphemy?

4. Who and how many were ever either tormented or put to death for Hereſie, from 1641 till 1660: I remember not one, ſave that *James Nayler* was impriſoned and whipt, and had his Tongue bored for blaſphemous Perſonating Chriſt, and that not by the Presbyterians.

5. Why are they ſo ordinarily reproached by the Prelatiſts for tolerating all Sects here in *England*?

6. What if all this had been true? What is it to me or any of my mind? I never had a hand in perſecuting one man, to my remembrance. How few can you name of all the Nonconformiſts now in *England*, that had any hand in the Severities you mention?

mention? I know not four in *England*, that I remember. And what's this to us any more than to you?

7. And was it well done, or ill? If well, why do you liken them to the Inquiſition? Are you for it? If ill, why do you plead for it in others? Imitate it not if you diſlike it.

For my part, as I am againſt all Sects as ſuch, I am much more againſt the cruelty of any. I ſtick no more at the diſgracing the Presbyterians ſins, than yours: And I am readier to diſgrace my own than either, if I can know them. I would cheriſh Errours no more than you; but I would not ruine or impriſon even ſuch of your ſelves as have too many. Hereſie muſt have its proper cure. I thank God I had once an Orthodox agreeing Flock. But again I ſay, the Presbyterians were too impatient with Diſſenters; and it's better have variety of Fiſh in the Pond, than by the Pikes to reduce them to ſpecial unity.

§ 16. He ſaith that *Neſtorius conſequentially denyed the God-Head of Chriſt*. p. 192. Next he hath found a contradiction in my words, that the *Emperor was weary of this ſtir*: And yet that [*Cyril did it to pleaſe the Court*] Theſe critical men can make their two hands enemies to each other. How came he waking to dream that this was a contradiction, when Hiſtorians tell us that the Women and Courtiers hated both *Chryſoſtome* and *Neſtorius*? He implyeth that the *Emperor* and the *Court* were all one, or of one mind. But I am not bound to believe him, no more than of many other Emperours whoſe Wives kept up one party and they another. And I pray you why ſhould we be confident that *Theodoſius* 2. himſelf called an *Eutychian* by the hereticating Biſhops, was not againſt *Neſtorius* when he called that Council, & at firſt Condemned both him and *Cyril*, and after him alone? I did but recite the Hiſtorians words, and was that *forgetfulneſs*?

§ 17. His many words about this controverſie with *Neſtorius* are the moſt unworthy of any anſwer of all his Books: ſometime he ſaith as I, as p. 193. [*It had been happy for the Church if the myſteries of our Religion had never been curiouſly diſputed*: ſometime he confeſſeth *that* Neſtorius *ſpake the ſame thing with* Cyril, *that Chriſt had two natures in one Perſon*: ibid. *And that he expreſſeth himſelf one would think very orthodoxly*. p. 202. *But the Heretick diſſembled and hid his ſence*. And ſo this man after above 1000 years knew the mans mind to be contrary to his words: whereas it's palpable to him that readeth the Hiſtories, that the man

man was ſo far from *hiding* and *diſſembling*, that he was ſowrly and moroſely addicted to ſtick to the words and Notions he had eſpouſed, and too little to regard a peaceable complyance to mollifie his accuſers. His fault lay on the clean contrary ſide, But he proveth him a Heretick that meant *Chriſt* was two *Perſons*, though he ſaid the contrary, 1. Becauſe he ſaith that the Humane Nature was united in *dignity* and *honour* to the Divine.

Anſ. As if either the hypoſtatical union were denyed by thoſe words, or he knew that *Neſtorius* meant not to include it in thoſe terms:

But he ſaith he uſeth the word προσωπον, and not ὑπόστασις. *Anſ.* As if προσωπον never ſignifyed more than a Relative or official Perſon, when beſides the many places cited by *Derodon*, *Neſtorius* oft explaineth himſelf in the common orthodox ſence.

But the fouleſt charge is, that he ſeems once or twice to diſtinguiſh Chriſt from the Divine Nature. *Anſ.* By [Chriſt] he expreſſeth himſelf to mean the *humane nature anointed to his Office*: And the man thought that the Divine Nature was not ſo anointed: and diſtinguiſhing is not dividing.

It is not his *Nay* and my *Yea* that can inform any Reader what *Neſtorius* ſaid and meant without reading his own words (rather than *Cyrils* of him.) And if ſuch as Mr. *M.* will pretend Charity, and contrary to plain evidence face down the world that a *Man dergeth conſequentially Chriſts God-Head, and the Unity of his Perſon*, while he profeſt the contrary, no mans innocency is ſufficient to eſcape the fangs of ſuch hereticaters: And let him call me what his liſt inclineth him to call me, I again profeſs that on the reading of *Cyril*, *Neſtorius*, and the Council, and *Derodon*'s Citations, I am quite paſt doubt that the controverſy was Verbal, which of them *ſpake orthodoxly* while they both meant the ſame thing; and when one ſaid *Mary was the Mother of God*, and the other ſaid, no; *She was but the Mother of that Perſon who is God*; the *fitneſs* of the phraſe was the matter of their quarrel.

And conſider 1. Many think that when a high point is in controverſy to the danger of the Church, we muſt uſe the exacteſt phraſes, and not ſay all that may be juſtified.

2. And as *forma dat nomen*, ſo *locutio formalis*, or denominating *à forma* is more exact and proper than *à materia*: And therefore though *idioms* may be Communicated, he that in controverſie denomi-

denominateth the Divine Nature from its own properties, speaks more exactly.

3. If one should in our Pulpits say ordinarily [*The World was Created by Man*:] *The eternal proceeding of the Holy Ghost was from a Man*: *Flesh and Blood was from Eternity*;] many sound Christians would not like it. And yet it's true in the Communicative sense, *viz.* [He that is now man made the world as God: The Holy Ghost eternally proceeded from the 2d Person in the Trinity who is now God and Man: Christ who was flesh and blood on Earth, was Eternal as God.] So if one now say [God was confined to the Virgins Womb, and to the Manger: God could not speak in the Infancy of Christ: God was but about 30 year old when Christ was Baptized: God knew not the day nor the hour of Christs second coming: God was asleep, hungry, sorrowful, in an agony, crucified, dead, buried, *&c.*] All this is thus far true, *viz.* Of *Christ* who was God, not as God but as man: And yet if I should deny but the *fitness* of *this* speaking, I were just such an Heretick as *Nestorius* was: And many that are no Hereticks for all that would not relish it.

Either my Eyes could not find that in *Nestorius* which he affirms of him or else he is a meer slanderer of him, when he saith Pag. 193 that he *denyed* Yea obstinately] that *Mary was the Mother of that Person who was God.*] He hath produced no such word. That which he stood to was, that instead of *saying Mary was the Mother of God*, we should say *she was the Mother of Christ who is God and Man.* And of the unity of Person I have cited already his own words so fully, as moved *Derodon* to say [*I dare boldly say, no Christian hath hitherto spoken trulyer and plainer of the unity of Christs Person in two natures than* Nesto - rius] And that it's false that he confest but an union of dignity the same cited words shew: *Nexu adeo sublimi* (saith he) *Divinoque & admirabili* (mentioning the conjunction of the Divinity and humanity) *ut Divina natura ea sibi vendicet quæ Corporis alioquin sint propria*] Epist. ad Cyril.

And as to all his justifications of *Cyril*, he knoweth that I justify his Doctrine as well as he, but not the work that he made, which is not undone among Nations of *Nestorians* to this day. But if the man were able to be impartial, and so happy as not to draw on himself the guilt of such sins by justifying them, he might easily see in his own confession that *Cyril* the Hereticator

spake

ſpake as bad at leaſt as *Neſtorius*. He oft confeſſeth (for he cannot deny it) [*that he doth frequently own but one nature*] p. 197. and 198. [*that there is but one nature of the word incarnate*] ſo p. 201. *&c.* But *Cyril* meant well, that is, by *Nature* he meant *Perſon*. And was not this *Eutychian* Speech as improper as *Neſtorius's* is? Is the *nature* and *Perſon* to be confounded? Did the Fathers ſpeak thus? If *Nature* put for *Perſon* be pardonable, why is it not pardonable to prefer a denomination a *proprietate vel forma*, to another? And thus you make *Cyril* to differ from the *Eutychians*, in their different meanings while they uſed the ſame words. If I had ſaid that Chriſt had but one *Nature* I ſhould have had a cenſure otherwiſe meaſured.

And though this man ſeem to deny it, I have cited many of his words in which he ſaith [*Duas naturas unitas aſſerimus: poſt unionem vero tanquam adempta jam in duas diſtinctione, unam eſſe credimus filii naturam, tanquam unius ſed inhumati & incarnati & adſucceſ. Nihil injuſti facimus dicentes, ex duabus naturis factum eſſe concurſum in unitatem: Poſt unionem vero non diſtinguimus naturas ab invicem.* But I have cited enough before.

The ſum and truth is, to judge no one but my ſelf, I muſt be blind by ignorance or partiality if I be not paſt doubt, 1. That unskilful explication was their difference. 2. That *Cyrils* words were *Eutychian*. 3. That *Neſtorius* words were orthodox in the main, but not ſufficiently yielding to a tolerable phraſe. 4. That they both meant the ſame thing. 5. That all their war was managed, 1. For want of diſtinguiſhing fully the *Abſtract* [*Deitatem*] and the *Concrete* [*Deum*] 2. For want of diſtinguiſhing [*Qui Deus*] from [*Qua Deus*] and a ſtrict formal expreſſion from a more laxe that's tolerable. And 3. For want of diſtinguiſhing [*diviſion*] from [*diſtinction*] of natures. 4. For want of explaining the various ſorts and ſenſes of [*Unity*] and [*Plurality.*] I cannot but know this to be true, though Mr. *M.* ſcorn me for it.

What [*I that underſtand not the language they wrote in to pretend to know better than the Council?*] *Anſ.* 1. So ſay the Papiſts: what? will you pretend to know more than the Church and Councils? If it be implicite faith that they are bringing us to, let them tell us which Councils we muſt ſo believe when they condemn each other? 2. I thought I could make ſhift to underſtand their language, though I be no critick in it: But if he know me

me better, I ſtrive not for the reputation of Learning; not only *Baronius* and *Binnius*, and all the reſt that he nameth that had no skill in Greek, but moſt of the Schoolmen, ſeem to me without it, far more Learned than he. I can tell him of Lads whoſe Learning I admire not, that ſhall vie with him in Languages Oriental and Occidental, and give him odds; And when he ſcorns *Derodons* diſtinctions, telling us it's *making two bad Groats by ſlitting a Sixpence*, &c. I leave him to glory in his Confuſion: But I ſuſpect the Fox that ſpeaks againſt Tails is like enough to want one himſelf.

But when he hath ſhewed in all this Hiſtory of *Neſtorius*, *Cyril*, and the Council, little but that partiality which can talk confidently to the ignorant for any cauſe, without any ſhew of confuting *Derodons* juſtification of *Neſtorius*, or my Conciliation, his craft or paſſion attempts to divert the Reader by the art of the times, and as if it muſt ſtop our Mouths from lamenting the ſin of Hereticators, and miſery of the Church thereby, he tells us how men in theſe times call them Papiſts that are none.

Anſ. If it be ill done, why condemn you your ſelf by defending thoſe that did the like? If it was well done in Biſhops Councils, why not in them? 2. But what's this to me, if it be not me that he means? If it be, 1. If you will read but the laſt part of my *Cathol. Theolog.* judge of the mans front. 2. It is none but thoſe that are for a humane Soveraignty over all the Church on Earth that we judge Papiſts: And if you judge them not ſuch, we will thank you to tell us what a Papiſt is in your own ſenſe.

§ 18. His ſaying *p.* 225. that [*John Comes that gives a ſad account of the Council is much to be ſuſpected*, &c. doth but tell us that he would have your belief of Hiſtory guided by the Intereſt of his Cauſe.

§ 19. As to his ſcorn againſt my tranſlating the words [*the Scripture and Sacred*] which mean that imperial Scripture, I did think a litteral Tranſlation could not have been judged a miſunderſtanding or miſtranſlation: Why may they not be called in *Engliſh* what they are called in *Greek*? And he had a ſtrong imagination if he thought that *Haumers* Tranſlation of *Euſebius*, &c. afforded me ſuch materials as theſe.

§ 20. His concluſion of ſome that ſcorn to preach by the *Licence* of the Government I before mentioned. The Truth and

miniſterial Honeſty of it, is much like as if Thouſands ſhould petition the Biſhop, that their ſick families may have licenſed Phyſicians, and he rejecteth all their Petitions, and prevaileth with the Parliament to do the like: At laſt the King pittieth them, and licenſeth the Phyſicians, and the Biſhop and his Clergy are offended, and get it revoked, and the Phyſicians practiſe at their peril without licenſe: And our credible Hiſtorian ſhould record it, that they ſcorned to practiſe as licenſed by the Government, even while ſtill they make all the Friends they can to the Clergy to be licenſed, and are not able to prevail. But the ages that knew not them and us, that are to come, may poſſibly believe theſe men as they believe their Predeceſſors.

§ 21. To conclude, Reader, if now thou have any ſenſe of Chriſtian Intereſt, Unity and Love, judge of the whole caſe impartially, and begin with notorious matter of fact.

1. We find at this day a great Body of Chriſtians, called *Neſtorians*, inhabiting the Countries of *Babylon*, *Aſſyria*, *Meſopotamia*, *Parthia*, and *Media*, yea, ſpread Northerly to *Cataya*, and Southerly to *India*; abundance of them even in *Tartary*, ſaith *Paulus Venet.* See *Brierwood* p. 139. And we find that they are by the Weſtern Churches, if not the *Greeks*, called Hereticks, and at the eaſieſt Schiſmaticks. And yet as thoſe very Friars that have lived among them ſay, they are commonly free from any ſuch Opinions as are charged on them, but only honour the name of *Neſtorius*, and condemned the Councils that condemned him. This Mr. *M.* nor no Prelate will deny that retaineth humanity.

2. We find that this woful fraction hath continued about one Thouſand two Hundred and thirty Years.

3. We are put to enquire what was and is the cauſe; and we find that on both ſides it is the Biſhops and their Clergy that now continue it, and it was Patriarchs and their Biſhops that at firſt cauſed it.

4. We enquire how they did it: And Mr. *Morrice* confeſſeth that it began in a diſpute between the two Patriarchs (whether the Virgin *Mary* was to be called *The Mother of God*, or rather *The Mother of Jeſus Chriſt who is God and Man*: and that on this occaſion *Cyril* charged *Neſtorius*, as making Chriſt to be two Perſons, and he himſelf ſaid Chriſt incarnate had but *one Nature*, but had no more skill in ſpeaking, than by *one Nature* to mean

mean *one Perſon*, (though *Derodon* labour to prove that he meant worſe,) that *Neſtorius* profeſſed two Natures in one Perſon. And Mr. *M.* ſaith, *Neſtorius* when he ſpake well meant ill, and *Cyril* when he ſpake ill meant well. And upon this a General Council itſelf is firſt divided about them, even to blows: and after by the importunity of *Cyril*'s party, *Neſtorius* is baniſhed, and the Biſhops divided, ſome for one, and ſome for another to this day. Another Council is called at *Calcedon*, and confirmeth the Condemnation, and the *Neſtorian* Biſhops condemn that Council, and for many Ages the Biſhops were divided alſo about that, one part condemning it, and the other ſubſcribing to it, and honouring it. Judge now what theſe Biſhops have done to Chriſtian Religion and the Church of Chriſt, and continue to do: And if you dare join with our Canoneers in making the guilt your own, by juſtifying ſuch diſmal work; the further you go, the more of it you have to juſtifie, till your Souls have guilt and load enough.

Honeſt Dr. *Moore* charged with Neſtorianiſm, is fain to accuſe *Neſtorius* out of his Enemies words to clear himſelf. That he owned not a [*Phyſical Union of Natures*] is an ambiguous, unſafe word: A Phyſical Union ſeems to ſignifie one φύσις which is not to be ſaid. He never denied a perſonal or Hypoſtatical Union. And if he had (as he did not) oppoſed the word *Hypoſtaſis*, ſo did *Hierom* that was no Heretick, and many more for a long time.

I ſuppoſe Mr. *M.* is not more zealous againſt Neſtorianiſm than the Hereticating Church of *Rome* is: And how great they really thought the *Neſtorian* Hereſie, the ſtory which I mention of *P. Hormiſda* tells you, which I will repeat. [There aroſe a controverſie whether it might be ſaid that [*One of the Trinity was crucified,*] Pope *Hormiſda* ſaid [*No*] becauſe they that were for it were ſuſpected to be *Eutychians*: The *Neſtorians* laid hold on this, and ſaid, [*Then we may not ſay that* Mary *was the Parent of one of the Trinity.*] This was a hard caſe: *Juſtinian* ſent to Pope *John* about it. His infallibility and *Hormiſda*'s were contrary: he and his Council ſay that we may ſay, that [*One of the Trinity was crucified.*] Hereupon *Baronius* and *Binnius* give us a uſeful note, [*Ita mutatis hoſtibus arma mutari neceſſe fuit.*] What ſhould the World do if we had not had ſuch a Judge of Controverſies. I hope Mr. *M.* will not be ſo heretical, or ſchiſmatical,

as to ſay that either of theſe Popes erred againſt an Article of Faith: But will rather recant his Accuſation of *Neſtorius*, and number this with *Things Indifferent*, which the Church hath power to change at her pleaſure.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Council of Epheſus 2d.

§ 1. THat our Hiſtorian may juſtifie the Dividers he makes himſelf a Party, and by downright miſtake againſt both ſaith, 1. That *Neſtorius fell into Blaſphemy, denying Chriſt to be true God.* 2. And that *Eutyches denied Chriſt to be true Man.*] This is our Reformer of Hiſtory; when both of them profeſſed Chriſt to be true God, and true man. I doubt not but the Man can write another Book to juſtifie this; for what is it that ſome cannot talk for? Yea, he is at it again, *p.* 230. that *Eutyches* held Chriſt not to be *true Man.*

§ 2. He confeſſeth again that *Cyril* affirmeth but *one Nature*, and meant but *one Perſon*, and that *Eutyches* uſed the ſame words, but ſaith, *ſure they cannot be ſo mad as to fall out ſo violently when they ſay the ſame thing & words.* Flavian *could not be ſo fooliſh or ſo wicked*, &c. *Anſ.* I juſtifie not the words of *Eutyches* or *Cyril*; but if I have great reaſon to believe, that as he confeſſeth *Cyril* ſo groſs as to uſe φύσις for ὑπόστασις, ſo *Eutyches* who had far leſs Learning than *Cyril*, did word amiſs the conceptions, which were the ſame with *Cyrils*, I leave it to this mild Cenſurer to call them *Fools*, and *mad*, and *wicked.* It's taken for railing in me to blame them.

§ 3. He ſaith [*Cyril never ſaid there were two Natures in Chriſt before the Union. Anſ.* I have twice cited his words: Find a true difference between them and thoſe of *Eutyches* if you can. I believe they both meant better than they ſpake.

§ 4. But the Spirit of detraction uſeth to fetch Accuſations from *Hearts*, & *Thoughts*, and *ſecret Actions*, and ſo doth he againſt *Eutyches*; and he ſaith *this hath been done of late times, To deliver that in ſelect Meetings, which they will not in publick promiſcuous Aſſemblies: as evil Spirits are under reſtraint in conſecrated places.*

Anſ.

Anſ. Therefore it is that the Nonconformiſts have 20 or 19 years ſo earneſtly beg'd for leave to preach in publick conſecrated places to promiſcuous Aſſemblies, that they might be out of ſuſpicion, but could never obtain it of this ſort of Maſters. *Ex ore tuo*--- Thus they that caſt the ſtone at others oft find it hit themſelves. Mr. *Edwards Gangrena* is here commended to thoſe that are for Toleration. As if all differences were equally intolerable or tolerable: And he that ſaith [*Tolerate not thoſe that preach Blaſphemy or intolerable errour*,] ſaid no worſe than he that ſaith [*Silence Two Thouſand Preachers, unleſs they will Profeſs, Promiſe, and Swear, and do all that is (oft deſcribed) impoſed on them.*

§ 5. In his Narrative he is no more tender of the honour of Biſhops it ſeems than I am, nor ſo much of Emperours; for when he had ſaid the Emperour [*was too much addicted to this kind of Vermine* (Eunuchs) *and ſhews his bitterneſs againſt* Flavian, he ſaith that *the Letters which called this Council ſuggeſted ſufficiently what it was to do, and that their buſineſs was to condemn a Biſhop the Emperour did not care for, though without any juſt ground, nay, for his honeſty.*

I deny none of this: But were the Biſhops of the Catholick Church in a good caſe then, that, when they knew before that they were called to ſuch a work as this, would meet in a General Council and do it? No; he accuſeth them himſelf, I need not do it.

The Emperour, he ſaith, *knew how to chooſe Biſhops*, (and yet his Summons was general to all to come,) and the *Preſident, if half be true that is ſaid of him*, (and if that be a doubt, how credible are your Hiſtorians?) *was one of the moſt wicked, profligate Wretches in the World*,] yet he was one of the Patriarchs, and all the Council Biſhops, and till they met, were not thus accuſed. You ſee the man is a far greater railer than I even againſt Biſhops: But it is but againſt thoſe that are againſt his Intereſt and ſide.

§ 6. He deſcribes thoſe Biſhops as uſing violence, forgetting that it is it his Party truſteth to continually: juſt with the front as *Baronius* and *Binnius*, and many other Papiſts, juſtifie *Martin* for being againſt putting Hereticks to death, and condemn *Ithacius*, while their Kingdom is upheld by that which they condemn, and worſe, even the burning of true Chriſtians as Hereticks, and it's Heretical with them to imitate *Martin*, juſt as

thoſe

those *Matth.* 23. Your Fathers killed the Prophets, and you build their Sepulchers, and say if we had lived in the days of our Fathers, we would not, *&c.*

§ 7. But in the passage I find our Historian in a more charitable mood to this *Ephesine* Council of Bishops than his Brethren, [*How bad soever* Dioscorus *and this Council were, yet they are in my judgment to be looked on rather as favourers of Heresie than Hereticks, they followed the meaning I believe as well as the Words of* Cyril.] *Ans.* And now I may hope I am Orthodox and Charitable when I have no less than his Judgment to justifie mine. And *Anatolius* justifieth us both.

§ 8. But Sir, now you are in a good Mood, will you consider,

1. Whether those Bishops and Councils that set the Christian World in that Flame that burneth dreadfully to this day, after above 1200 Years, were not guilty at least of a peccadillo or venial sin.

2. Whether they are imitable.

3. Whether this General Council had a supream Legislative and Judicial power over all the Church on Earth, which all must obey and none must appeal from.

No: saith Bishop *Gunning, It was a meeting of violent Robbers.*

Ans. But it was a General Council: which it seems then may be such.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the 4th *General Council at* Calcedon.

§ 1. HE begins his Chapter comically, and notably derideth me for saying *Pulcheria* was the same that before at *Ephesus* had set the Bishops against *Nestorius.* Is this so ridiculous? It's well known that Historians make her very powerful with her Brother: she chose his Wife *Eudocia,* (They were long of two minds.) It's no wonder that she that got him condemned at *Ephesus,* got the the same further done at *Calcedon,* when she was Empress her self, having made *Martian* Emperour, and her nominal Husband, (for they were not conjugally to know each other.) Is there any thing in this that deserveth the stage? Though *Theodosius* be reproached by Popish Historians

as

as an Eutychian, or a favourer of them, if credible honeſt *Socrates* may be believed, there have been few ſuch Princes in the World, (for Piety, his Houſe was a Church; for Patience, never ſeen angry; for Compaſſion, would never let a man die for Treaſon againſt himſelf.) But his Siſter (a Woman eminent for Wit and Piety) was thought to govern him very much, & ſpecially in the ſeverities againſt *Neſtorius*. *Evagrius* who bitterly reproacheth *Neſtorius*, tells us of ſome writings of his that fell into his hand, in which he ſaith, that the Emperour was his friend, and would not ſign his baniſhment, and laies the cruelties that he underwent on his Officer: and conſidering the caſe of a ſuffering man, I ſee nothing unſeemly in the Letter to him, which *Evagrius* chargeth with contempt.

§ 2. My wiſh for the Churches Peace, that the unskilful words of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches* had been ſilenced by neglect, rather than the flame blown up by honouring them with two General Councils diſputation, doth with this Gentleman deſerve this Replication, [*He cannot be more violent and outragious, more bitter and malicious under all the provocations imaginable, than he is under that neglect which himſelf preſcribeth for the cure.*] *Anſ.* If this be a true accuſer, he can prove what he ſaith: It's eaſie to ſay this of any man: But if a man that hath a cholerick Stomack ſhall ſwear that there was Aloes in his Phyſick, his word is no proof. Theſe are the men into whoſe hands we are by Gods permiſſion falln, while we are caſt out, judged to ſilence, priſons, & beggary, if we do but repeat the words of the Laws and Canons, and in 17 Years time when moſt that they turned out are dead, if the reſt at their own urgent demand do but tell them what they judge unlawful, and anſwer thoſe that accuſe them, they are *outragious*, *violent*, *bitter*, and *malicious*. As if one that wounds me ſhould ſue me for ſaying, *You hurt me*. It's violence and an unpeaceableneſs to feel, but none at all in them to *ſtrike* or to *deſtroy*. We will give you many thanks if you will hurt us no more than we do you.

§ 3. I ſaid that *one skilful healing man that could explicate ambiguous words, and perſuade men to Love and Peace, till they underſtood each other, had more befriended Truth, Piety, and the Church, than the hereticating Councils did.*] And *why*, ſaith he, *may not that skilful man ſhew his skill in Councils, as well as elſe where?*

Anſ. Who denieth it? But the queſtion is, how he ſhall be heard

heard and prevail? I told you that here *One man in one sentence did so*, by differencing between *mental distinguishing* and *dividing*; even *Basil* of *Seleucia*, saying, [*Cognoscimus duas naturas, non dividimus; neque divisas, neque confusas dicimus.*] This was true and plain enough, to have ended all the quarrel: But who laid hold on it, or did improve it? What the better was *Nazianzen* for speaking well in the Council at *Constantinople*? Or *Chrysostome* for any thing he could say to the Bishops for himself? I hope few of all that great number of Councils that were *Arian*, *Semiarian*, *Eutychian*, *Monothelites*, for Images, *&c.* were so bad as to have never a Bishop among them that could or would speak right: But did they prevail? In the very Council at *Trent* were more good Speeches than did prevail; and if *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Zuinglius*, and such others, had not done more good singly by Writing and Preaching, than *Dudithius* could do at *Trent*, or any of them at *Wormes*, or *Ratisbone*, &c. there had been little done. What good did *Philpot* do in the Convocation? Some say one *Paphnutius* turned the Inclination of the first *Nicene* Council for good; But that hearing temper was too short or rare.

§ 4. Next he tells us, that [*in many late Disputes of Justification*, &c. *we find not that any of these healing men were able to reconcile Parties any more than the Councils of old.*]

Answ. 1. If that were true, it's also true, that they have not made so great and many Parties as Councils did. We have not cast the world into so many Nations of *Jacobites*, *Nestorians*, and other Sects.

Answ. 2. Through God's mercy it is much better than such Historians would make men believe. Dr. *Heylin* tells us what work the *Arminian* Controversie made between Bishop *Laud*'s Party, and the Parliaments and Abbots Party, as if it had set us all by the Ears. It is not so now: One of your Brethren lately tells us, how that Controversie is quieted: What Contention do you hear of among the Nonconformists about it? No man hath so much as writ a line, that I know of, against my Conciliation in my *Cathol. Theology*. How little stir doth the *Antinomian* Controversie make? If one or two men do vent their displeasure about any of these, we neglect it, and it is presently forgotten. I hear sometime that called Arminianism hotly preached in the Parish Churches: It provoketh not me, and I take no notice

notice of it. I (rarely) hear ſome preach againſt the *Arminians*: I take no notice of it, and there it dies: Whereas if one ſhould write Challenges and Accuſations to the Preachers, we might make work enough for all the Country. I never yet met with many ſuch, but if you make not a War of it, and engage them by oppoſition, they grow weary themſelves, and grow into unobſerv'd neglect or contempt. Moſt of the ſpreading Errours and Contentions among us have come by the Bellows of too ſtrong or imprudent Oppoſition or Diſputes. I hear of no conſiderable Doctrinal Strivings among all the Nonconformiſts now in *England*. One Ignorant Uncalled Fellow is lately crept into *London*, and wrote proud Challenges for Antinomianiſm, and none anſwered him, and he is contemned, and hath no Second that I hear of.

§ 5. Though he ſay [*he is weary, yet he muſt not paſs by*, that when I mention *Socrates* his moſt high praiſe of *Theodoſius* (living under him) and the miracles which he ſaith God wrought for him; I ſay, *if this be true, God owned his Moderation by Miracles, notwithſtanding his favouring the* Eutychians, *more than he did any ways of violence.*] And here the man hath found me in Contradiction, and ſaith, [*Thoſe miracles could not countenance the* Eutychian *cauſe that was after.* 2. *That the* Eutychians *were the moſt violent men.* Such Contradictions he and *L'Eſtrange* find in my Writings.

Anſ. But, 1. Is it true that I ſaid thoſe miracles countenanced the *Eutychian* Cauſe? I ſaid only that *God owned* the *Moderation* (not the *Eutychian* Opinion) of a man called an *Eutychian* by the Hereticators, notwithſtanding his favouring the *Eutychians*. He was a man that ſtudied the reconciliation of the contending Biſhops, and was moderate towards all, but perſuaded that the major Vote of the Biſhops being againſt *Neſtorius*, and for *Cyril*, and *Dioſcorus*, it tended to peace to take that ſide. His Moderation was the ſame before the ſtir with *Eutyches* as after. I only ſaid that God by miracles owned that mans moderation, who is charged with after favouring the *Eutychians*.

2. And what I ſpake of Moderation oppoſite to violence, in way of ſuppreſſing Hereticks, he feigneth me to ſpeak it as oppoſite to violence in the *Perſons ſuppreſſed*: I ſpake of *Violence* in the Prince as agent, and he feigneth me to ſpeak of Violence in the parties that he dealt with. He may find matter at this rate

to write greater Volums againſt any man. I read of none of the Hereſies then contended about, *Neſtorian* or *Eutychian*, but the accuſed Biſhops were violent for them: But though they were all violent, yet if the queſtion were, whether the Emperour ſhould uſe violence or Moderation againſt them, I may ſay, that God owneth more the way of Moderation.

§ 6. *P.* 246. he ſaith [*At* Epheſus Euſtathius *was kikt to death, and all thoſe that durſt defend him were threatned to be ſerved in like manner.*] *Anſ.* Of this before: His memory failed him: It was not *Euſtathius* but *Flavianus*. 2. Yet he after excuſeth *Dioſcorus* from Hereſie; more Biſhops than were Hereticks were violent.

§ 7. As to his Reflection, ["*It may be he thinks the Empe-*"*rour took a particular Delight in that kind of cruelty, and that* "*he had rather one ſhould be kickt to death, than that he ſhould be* "*hanged or beheaded; which would not be much to the credit of his* "*Moderation*: *And to ſay the truth, his Letter to* Valentinian "*diſcovers a ſtrange kind of Spirit; for there he juſtifies the pro-*"*ceedings of the* Eutychians *at* Epheſus, *and ſaies that all things* "*were carried on with much freedom and perfect Truth, and* Flavi-"an *found guilty of Innovating in Religion. This is but an ill ſign* "*that Mr.* B. *is a hater of falſe Hiſtory, when he lets this paſs un-*"*reproved.*

Anſ. 1. Had I reproved ſuch an Emperour, I might have expected that ſome of you would have publiſhed me an Enemy to Kings.

Anſ. 2. Rather Sir, you and I ſhould hence gather, that all men muſt have pardon and forbearance, and that for want of that, the names of Neſtorians, Jacobites, Melchites, Greeks, Papiſts, Proteſtants, Lutheranes, Calviniſts, Prelatiſts, and Presbyterians, &c. have almoſt ſwallowed up the Name, much more the Love of Chriſtians.

Anſ. 3. May it not conſiſt with modeſty and the *hatred* of *falſe Hiſtory*, to believe the high praiſes of this Emperour, publiſhed by one that knew him in ſo pious and credible words as *Socrates* ſpeaks, as I before told you, giving him (to me) a more credible Canonization than the Pope could have done, as a *man of eminent holineſs, wonderful Clemency, that would not let a Traitor go out of the Gates towards the place of Execution; and when he was moved to any Execution, anſwered, he had rather,*

were

were he able, reſtore the Dead to Life: excelling all the Clergy in meekneſs, and never ſeen angry. May not I who am branded for a railer by meek Prelatiſts, be tolerated to think charitably of ſuch an Emperour, and to wiſh that the world had many more ſuch.

Anſ. 4. Judges are taken for unjuſt if they will not hear both ſides ſpeak. And why ſhould not I regard the words of ſuch an Emperour, as well as of one half the Biſhops againſt the other?

Anſ. 5. Surely Modeſty requireth me to think that the Emperour was much more capable of knowing the truth of the acts of his own Subjects, when his Servants preſent gave him an account of them, than I am 1200 Years after: And ſo good a man would not willingly lye.

Anſ. 6. Therefore my own Concluſion is, God is true and all men are Lyars, that is, untruſty: and that *Eudocia* and his Courtiers had much power with him for *Dioſcorus* againſt *Flavian*, as *Pulcheria* had againſt *Neſtorius*; but that it was the Peace and Concord of the Biſhops which he moſt ſtudied, and thought that it lay in going with the major part. And I believe things were bad on both ſides, and worſe than the Emperour thought with the Eutychian Biſhops, and worſe than others ſay with their Adverſaries; and that the Emperour, though fallible, was as *Socrates* ſaith, beyond all the Clergie.

But here I ſee that I am blamed for not railing againſt a meek and pious Emperour, and as a Railer for lamenting the ſins of the Clergie.

§ 8. About the Council of *Calcedon* he accuſeth me in general, as [*diſingeniouſly mincing the Acts, and uſing all the foul play poſſible.*

Eaſily ſaid: And what's the proof? Why, 1. Leave out that *they were violently beaten to it.*

Anſ. The Reader may ſee that this is falſe: I mention it oft, *pag.* 101. [*The Biſhops anſwered, that they did it againſt their Wills, being under fear: Condemnation and baniſhment was threatned, Souldiers were there with Clubs and Swords.*] Shall I believe this man againſt ſuch as *Socrates*, of things done 1200 Years ago, that will face me down with ſuch untruths about my own yet viſible Writings?

2. But is it falſhood to omit what is ſaid in ſuch and ſo many Volumns? May not the Reader there ſee it? Do I contradict it?

Must I write many Folio's or nothing? I refer all Readers to the Acts.

§ 9. But he saith, [*It would go near to excuse their Compliance with a merciful man.*]

Ans. I confess such are not so bad as the Clergy-men, that will sin for meer Preferment, and will write against, and revile, and call for Execution on those that will not do as they. But if Nonconformists after 19 Years Ejection and Reproach, and Sufferings by more than Threats, should at last surrender to heinous sin, can he think it would excuse their Compliance, when Christ saith, *Luk.* 14 33. *He that forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my Disciple*? If he think Martyrdom a work of Supererogation, he is dangerously mistaken. And he that to day thinks *Threatning* and *Danger* an *Excuse for his sin*, may to morrow think Poverty, and the next day the desire of Preferment an excuse.

§ 10. *Dioscorus* and the *Eutychians* holding close to the Council of *Nice*, as sufficient, as a Test of the Orthodox, to which nothing was to be added, in reciting this he hath found my Ignorance in translating [*retractat*] by [*retract.*] Is not the English word of the same sence with the Latine? If not, and I be ignorant in English too, what wrong is that to any Bishop?

§ 11. When he had charged *Nonsence* and *Confusion* on that which he understood not, and mentioned *Euseb. Doril.* giving the Lye to *Eutyches*, he confesseth that the thing was true.

§ 12. *P.* 253. He saith, *When the giddy rabble of Monks with Swords and staves, like* Bedlams *broke loose, run upon them---- I should rather pity them than insult.*

Ans. If the History be an insulting, his own credited Historians insult by recording it. If noting it as a fault be insulting, then a motion to Repentance is insulting, and if he would have us pity them for their sin, and not only for their suffering, that is insulting too: But to own their sin, and draw men to imitate them, shall be none of my Compassion.

He minds me of *Peters* Denial, and the Disciples forsaking Christ. Alas! he is not a man that is not sensible of Humane frailty? But is it not therefore to be blamed? Why doth Scripture mention it, but that we may avoid the like? Is it to tempt others to the like? Did Christ insult when he said to *Peter*, *Get thee behind me Satan*, &c.

§ 13. He next falls into his familiar strain, to carry that *ex Cathedra*

Cathedra, by ſentence, which he cannot do by proof, and ſaith, [*When I venture on Obſervations it's an even lay that I am out.*] *Anſ.* That is, I am out of the way of his Magiſtry, Preconceipt and Intereſt.

It is my Conciliatory words that the peaceable man is angry at, *viz.* [*That this doleful, Contentious, Anathematizing, and ruining of each other, was about the ſenſe of ambiguous words, and they were both of one mind in the matter and knew it not.*] He cannot but confeſs, that my judgment of them is ſofter than theirs that hereticate each other. And *Derodon* hath fully proved that this Council when they condemned *Neſtorius*, were of his Judgment in the whole matter, and ſaid but the ſame as he.

§ 14. As to his telling me, that *Eutyches* denied Chriſt to be truly and properly man, I will no more believe him, than if he had ſaid *Cyril* did ſo.

§ 15. But he ſaith, the *Monothelites were the genuine Diſciples of* Eutyches. They were of his mind in that Conſequence: And ſuch another Controverſie it was. And how much greater errour againſt our Belief of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, have I proved *e. g.* to be, in your Dr. *Sherloks* Book; And yet I hope he meant better than he ſpake.

§ 16. P. 255. He confeſſeth of one Party what I ſaid, *viz.* [" *Of* Dioſcorus *and* Flavian, *I am apt to believe they were much* " *of the ſame Opinion as to the point in controverſie, and knew it* " *well enough; which was the only cauſe why* Dioſcorus *with his* " *party of Biſhops and Monks, would not endure to come to any De-* " *bate of the matter, for fear it would appear that they all agreed,* " *and then there would have been no pretence to condemn* Flavian, " *which was the Deſign, if not of the Emperour, yet at leaſt of thoſe* " *that governed him.*]

Anſ. Fie Dr. will you thus abuſe ſo many Orthodox Biſhops? And almoſt condemn your vindicating Book? And harden me in my Errour? But I am much of your mind, and if one of us err, ſo doth the other.

§ 17. And I like his Ingenuity, ſaying *Anatolius* confeſſeth in Council, that *Dioſcorus was not condemned for Hereſie but Tyranny, and no man contradicted him. Anſ.* Not in anſwer to thoſe words, but the Accuſations of many contradicted him before.

§ 18. That they mean one thing by their various expreſſions I have

I have fully proved, and he no whit confuteth: That the *Eutychians* acknowledged no distinct *Properties*, and *Nestorius* owned an Unity but in *Dignity* and *Title* only, are his flat slanders, to be no way proved but by their Adversaries accusations. The very words I named even now, [*Divino, mirabili, sublimi nexu.*] and many clearer, shew it of *Nestorius*. And I wish him to take heed himself how he defineth the Hypostatical Union, lest the next General Council (if ever there be one) make him an Heretick.

Can he believe that the great number of *Eutychian* Bishops were so mad, as not to know that Christs Mortality, possibility, material Quantity, Shape, *&c.* were the properties of Christs Humanity and not his Deity? But some Men can believe any thing well or ill, reasonable or unreasonable, as Interest and affection lead them.

§ 19. He saith, that [*If it were a faction that denied this, it was a strong one, and never was opposed by any Person before Mr.* Baxter.

Ans. I heard you were a young man; but if you be not above one Hundred Years old, your reading cannot be great enough to excuse this confidence from such temerity as rendereth you the less credible. How many Thousand Books be they which you or I never read? How know you that none of them all oppose it? But would you persuade the Reader that I call it a Faction, to believe your sence of these Councils? Factious men are forwardest to judge others Hereticks without cause; and all that I say is, that *Though such deny my Assertion it is true*: Doth it follow that I take all for *factious* that deny it? If I had said, [*Though Papists deny it,*] that had not been all one as to say, [*All are Papists that deny it.*]

2. But did never any person oppose it? 1. I named you *David Derodon* before, who though he largely labour to prove *Cyril* an *Eutychian* in words and sence, and that by φύσις he did mean *Natura*, and not *Persona*, yet as to *Nestorius* he copiously proveth, that the Council of *Calcedon* was just of his Mind, and condemned him for want of Understanding him. Though you have not seen that Book of *Derodons*, I have, and you should not judge of what you never saw.

2. *Luther de Conciliis* first accuseth *Nestorius* as a Heretick, denying Christ's Godhead, or holding two Persons; And presently

ly

ly retracts it, and confeſſeth he was ſeduced by believing the Papiſts, but (though he had not read much of the Councils, but what he had gathered out of the *Tripartite* and ſuch Hiſtorians) yet he gathered from the Paſſages of the Hiſtory, that the difference lay only in words, which he openeth at large, and yet turns it ſharply againſt *Neſtorius*, for thinking that we may not ſpeak of Chriſts Godhead or Manhood by communicated names or Attributes, and greatly rejoiceth that this ſerveth his turn in his Opinion about Conſubſtantiation and Sacramental words.

Becauſe I will leave nothing in doubt with you, but whether *Luther* was before my days, and leſt you ſay again that I cite Books which I ſee not, I will give you ſome of his words, beginning earlier, (not tranſlating leſt I have not skill enough) but they are ſo like mine, that I doubt you will be no Lutherane.

De Concil. pag. 175. *Eccleſiæ Romana & C. P. ambitioſe rixatæ ſunt de re nihili, vaniſſimis & nugaciſſimis naniis donec tandem utraque horribiliter vaſtata & deleta eſt.--- Illa omnia libentius recito, ut videat prudens Lector quomodo ex tam celebri Synodo Conſtantinopolitana, ſeu ex fonte manaverint ſemina maximarum Confuſionum propterea quod ibi Epiſcopus Eccleſiæ ut Patriarcha fuerat Præfectus.---* p. 178. *Quam horribilia certamina & contentiones moverunt hi duo Epiſcopi de primatu: ut facile judicari poſſet Spiritum ſanctum non eſſe authorem hujus Inſtituti: Alia habet Epiſcopus longe potiora quæ agat, quam ſunt hi pueriles & inepti ludi--- Præmonemur quod Concilia prorſus nihil novi debent comminiſci vel tradere.*

De Concil. Epheſ. p. 180, 181. *Exceſſerant jam è vivis ſancti Patres, & illi optimi Epiſcopi, S. Ambroſius, S. Martinus, S. Hieronymus, S. Auguſtinus (qui eo ipſo anno quo Synodus coacta eſt mortuus eſt) S. Hilarius, S. Euſebius & ſimiles; eorumque loco prorſus diſſimiles patres ſuborti fuerant. Ita ut Imperator Theodoſius amplius eligi Epiſcopum C. P. ex Sacerdotibus vel Clericis Civitatis C. P. nollet: hanc ob cauſam quod plerumque eſſent ſuperbi, ambitioſi, moroſi, qui movere certamina, & tumultus in Eccleſiis plerumque tolerent.----* p. 182. *Cum jam videret Neſtorius tantas turbas ortas ex corruptela multiplici, gemens prorupit in hæc verba,* Tollamus è medio omnes ambiguitates quæ primum præbuerunt occaſiones iſtis certaminibus, & fateamur palam Mariam recte vocari Matrem Dei. *Sed nihil profecit Neſtorius, ne tunc quidem*

cum

eum revocaret ſuum errorem; ſed voce publica conde muatus, ex orbe Imperii univerſo ejectus & exploſus eſt: Quanquam illi duo Epiſcopi Antiochenus & Alexandrinus, etiam poſt Concilium cum rediiſſent in ſuas Eccleſias, ſe ipſi mutuis convitiis lacerabant, & omnibus diris devovebant: Etſi poſtea res ad placidum exitum deducta eſt: Quanquam tamen dolendum hoc, & effuſis lachrymis deplorandum in Eccleſia eſt, tam præſtantes viros adeo indulſiſſe ſuis affectibus, ut inſtar mulierum aut puerorum ineptiſſime inter ſe rixarentur. Omnino fuiſſet eis opus aliquo Conſtantino, qui ipſorum jurgia & contentioſa ſcripta etiam conjeciſſet in ignem.--- p. 184. Mentioning the falſe accuſations of *Neſtorius*, making two Perſons, &c. [*Atque adeo intricata & confuſa ſunt quæ ſcribunt, ut exiſtimem ne quidem ipſos ſcire in hunc uſque diem, quid & propter quas cauſas damnaverint Neſtorium. Hoc inde conjicito. Fatentur credidiſſe Neſtorium quod Chriſtus ſit Deus & Homo--- exhis certum eſt quod Neſtorius non crediderit Chriſtum eſſe purum hominem.--- Conſtat Neſtorium non duos ſed unum Chriſtum credidiſſe, id quod ipſorum verba teſtantur---ideoque non potuit credere eſſe duas perſonas. Nec ullibi reperitur in hiſtoriis quod Neſtorius unum Chriſtum crediderit habere duas perſonas, niſi quod Pontifices & eorum hiſtoriæ ita argutantur. Apparet Papam & ſcriptores Pontificios hæc verba contra Neſtorium calumnioſe & veteratorie finxiſſe, quod Chriſtum pro puro homine & non pro Deo, & quod unum Chriſtum pro duabus perſonis vel gemino Chriſto habuerit.--- Neſtorius fuit homo inflatus tumens Phariſaico faſtu, & indoctus; Et cum ſubito eſſet evectus ad ſupremum faſtigium Eccleſiæ, adeo ut haberetur pro ſummo Pontifice, Patriarcha, ſomniabat ſe unum antecellere doctrina & eruditione omnes homines in toto genere humano, nec ſibi opus eſſe lectione librorum qui erant ſcripti à Majoribus aut aliis, nec in explicatione magnarum rerum retinendos eſſe modos loquendi antiquitus receptos in Eccleſia puriore; ſed quia & voce valebat, & ex temporali facundia volebat eſſe αὐτοδίδακτος, Doctor vel Magiſter, & formas loquendi quibus ipſe uteretur tantum recipiendas eſſe in Eccleſia, non alias. Et tali faſtu armatus adoriebatur illum articulum. Maria eſt mater Dei, aut genetrix Dei; Ibi viciſſim Epiſcopos in adverſa parte invenit perinde inflatos, quibus vehementer diſplicebat Neſtorii faſtus, in primis Cyrillum Alexandrinum: quia tunc nullus erat Auguſtinus aut Ambroſius.*--p. 189. *Hinc manifeſtum eſt, quod Neſtorius ut homo imprudens & vaniſſima perſuaſione adductus, loquatur quidem bono zelo de Chriſto: ſed*

ex

ex mera inſcitia non intelligat quid & quomodo loquatur.--- p. 192. *Non eſt Neſtorii error quod Chriſtum credit tantum eſſe purum hominem, nec in duas perſonas eum dirimi; ſed duas naturas Deum & hominem in una perſona uniri fatetur: ſed communicationem idiomatum non vult concedere. Objiciat autem hic aliquis, Neſtorium inſidioſe confeſſum eſſe, quod Chriſtus Deus ſit & una perſona. Reſp. Quod non: Tam ingenioſus enim & induſtrius non fuit, ſed ſerio ita judicavit.--- Ad hæc acceſſit aliorum Epiſcoporum inſolentia, qui non cogitaverunt quomodo ſananda eſſent talia vulnera, ſed multo magis irritandis & refricandis cauſam dederunt. Vide cætera.*

P. 202. De Concil. Calcedon. *Adeo indulgebant ſancti Patres mutuis odiis & diſſenſionibus ut alter non facile vellet alteri cedere*--- ſhewing the uncertainty of the Hiſtories of this Council, and the Lies of the Papiſts not to be truſted. *Jam divina qua ratione ego ero ſalvandus, qui nec ipſum Concilium aſſequor, nec cauſam Concilii ſatis perſpicio.* p. 205. *Quod Eutyches non tantum unam in Chriſto naturam eſſe ſtatuat, oſtendunt Papiſtarum Verba, qui dicunt Eutychen conceſſiſſe in Chriſto duas naturas,* viz. *Divinitatem & Humanitatem, quæ à Divinitate eſt aſſumpta*---*Sed quid Eutyches voluerit quod poſtea in Chriſto tantum Divina natura manſerit, deſerta humana, ibi prorſus ſunt muti; & re nondum certo cognitâ dicunt, ſtatuiſſe Eutychen quod in Chriſto duæ naturæ, & tamen non duæ ſed una natura ſit: Ita poſtea hiſtoriæ fiunt incertæ & obſcuræ, ut nemo poſſit intelligere quid Eutyches ſenſerit, aut quid Pontificiæ hiſtoriæ ſentiant. Amittimus hiſce ambagibus concilium una cum cauſis propter quas convocatum eſt.*---*Ego meas conjecturas recitabo: ſi rem aſſequor, bene; ſi non, non propterea labefactabitur fides Chriſtiana. Eutychis opinio (ſicut & Neſtorii) errat circa idiomata, quamvis alio modo. Neſtorius non vult idiomata humanitatis tribuere Divinitati in Chriſto:*---*Contra Eutyches non vult idiomata divinitatis tribuere humanitati, etiamſi & ipſe firmiter & mordicus retineat Chriſtum eſſe verum Deum & hominem. Ut ſi dicerem in Concione publica, Verbum filium Dei eſſe conditorem Cœli & Terræ æqualem Patri ab æterno*---*Et hoc Verbum, illum filium Dei eſſe verum hominem: Hoc concedit mihi Eutyches nihil dubitans. Jam ſi porro dicam, Quod ille homo Chriſtus ſit conditor cœli & terræ, hoc offendit Eutychen, qui putat prorſus eſſe abſurdum dicere,* Homo creat cœlum & terram.---- P. 210. *Ibi vides quod idiomata facili occaſione homines non præmonitos offendant & perturbent. Hic erat ſubveniendum teneris Conſcientiis fraterna, amica & ſalutari admo-*

 nitione

nitione, nec ſuperbiſſimi errantes abjiciendi eſſent. Utinam meo judicio non reſpondeat eventus: ſed vereor profecto aliquos hæreticos in noviſſimo die fieri judices; & illos ipſos Epiſcopos penes quos fuit judicandi poteſtas, in æternum damnatos, ni Deus eſt mirabilis & incomprehenſibilis in ſuis judiciis; niſi quod ſcimus eum eſſe propitium humilibus & infenſiſſimum ſuperbis. Et præſertim in Concilius & Eccleſiis nihil erat agendum zelo vel invidia, vel ſuperbia, quia Deus non poteſt ferre.

§ 20. Readers, you ſee what tedious work ſome men can make us: Many are ſcandalized, as if we gave them falſe Hiſtory, if we do not thus confute them; and if we do, we tire our ſelves and you. If I ſhould cite you many more thus to confute his falſhood, that *never perſon before me oppoſed that Faction*, you would be weary of it.

§ 21. Yet now my hand is in, you ſhall ſee further how much *Luther* was for the ſame that I have written. [*Qui volet poterit ulterius legere acta Concilii, privata opera. Ego ad tædium & nauſeam uſq; legi iſta; ejuſmodi Chaos cæremoniarum & confuſionum eſt ibi, ut videatur recte judicaſſe Greg. Naz. qui Synodis eruditioribus & ſedatioribus interfuit,--- & ſcribit* [*Sic affectus ſum ſi dicenda eſt veritas, ut malim omnes Epiſcoporum conventus vitare, quia nullius Synodi finem vidi bonum, aut qui magis tolleret mala quam augeret. Nam cupiditas contentionis & principatus, & æmulatio vincunt rationem. Ut profecto miror quod propter hæc verba non dudum eum excommunicaverunt ut atrociſſimum hæreticum. Sed quid ſit quod dicit in Synodis Epiſcopos certaſſe ambitione, ſuperbia, φιλονεικία, habes in hac Synodo clariſſimum exemplum. Quod autem certum ſit quod hic dicit ſe nullius Synodi vidiſſe finem bonum, docent nos hiſtoriæ: Nam Ariana hæreſis jocus fuit ante Nicænum Concilium præ illa confuſione quam ipſi poſt Concilium excitaverunt,* (that was not long of the Synod.) *Talis etiam fuit Macedonici & Neſtoriani Concilii. Nam illa pars quæ eſt condemnata eo fuit conjunctior, ut tali ſpecie concordiæ & unitatis ſuas præſtigias pingerent quaſi nulli juſta ratione damnari poſſent. Subinde excitarunt majora certamina contra Concilia quæ ipſi non recte intelligebant.---* P. 247. *Illud poſſum facillime probare quod miſer ille Paſtor in Hippone S. Auguſtinus plus docuit quam omnia Concilia--- Dicam & quiddam amplius: Majus Lumen accedit Doctrinæ Chriſtianæ ex Catechiſmo puerili quam ex omnibus Conciliis, & oratio Dominica & decem præcepta plus continent doctrinæ & eruditionis quam omnia Concilia.*

§ 22.

§ 2. Becauſe I recite the words of the Biſhops crying *Peccavimus*, he exclaimeth againſt me, as making *Repentance* and *Recantation* a deriſion, and this by the *Spirit of Schiſm which is nice in point of honour, no Conviction ſhall be able to reclaim it, though in the moſt indefenſible thing in the World.*]

Anſ. Add but with the Inquiſitors, [*Therefore burn them as hopeleſs,*] and you are come to the end of your Leſſon. The penetrating Wits of ſome men are admirable. This man whoſe face I never ſaw, knoweth my heart ſo much better than my ſelf and my acquaintance, that he can tell that it is to avoid diſhonour that I avoid Repentance, when I offer him my Oath, that if I have any knowledge of my own deſire, I would thank him as my deareſt Friend, who will by Evidence ſhew me any neceſſary truth that I deny, or Falſhood that I hold, and will joyfully publiſh my recantation.

2. And he can ſee Schiſm in my forbearing known and heinous ſin in the ſatisfaction of my Conſcience, while I write, and preach, and practiſe Communion with their Church, and can ſee none in ſilencing Thouſands, and *ipſo facto* excommunicating many more Thouſands of godly Chriſtians, and denying Baptiſm and the Lords Supper to ſuch as think it is ſinful to do—— he knows what.

3. And he can ſee thoſe things to be moſt indefenſible, which after our beſt ſtudy we take to be clear, and can get no rational Reply to our defence.

4. And (for want of memory or tenderneſs of his partners veracity) when their Advocates have ſo oft and ſcornfully charged me with *Retractations*, and alſo told the World how much my own party (as they call them) ſpeak againſt me, and my many large and free oppoſitions to the faults of Nonconformiſts that run into any extream, do all proclaim how little I have ſet by ſuch honour; yea, when himſelf ſaith that I have fiercely contended againſt all Sects and Parties, and they call me *Iſhmael*, whoſe hand is againſt every man: After all this to proclaim as aforeſaid, ſuch obſtinate Impenitence for the love of Honour, I confeſs doth no more further my conviction than the Oath of an Iriſh Witneſs would have done: For if he had ſworn it, I would have ſhewed my Books and their contrary teſtimony, and have askt him, whoſe honouring of me is it that I buy ſo dearly? It is not the Rulers, nor the Prelates, nor their Clergy,

nor their adherents, noble or ignoble: And if I have willingly and laboriouſly diſpleaſed and loſt the Sectaries too, whoſe honour is it that I ſell my Soul for?

§ 23. But did the man think that *Unconſtancy* and *compliance with* powerful Hereſie, is the ſame thing with Repentance for it? Or is it well done to perſuade the Reader that it is Repentance or Retractation of Hereſie I write againſt, when I recite the words of the Council and their own? Do I ſay that *peccavimus* was their ſin?

§ 24. And I would humbly deſire him in time to conſider, 1. Whether it was a venial ſin not to be named by me, when the moſt zealous Papiſts and Hiſtorians name it, for ſo great a number of Biſhops to turn and turn again ſo often, and that with Anathematizing one year of what they voted for before with Anathema to the contrary. I crave your impartial conſideration but of two Inſtances: How oft did they with Anathema's vote for and againſt the Council of *Calcedon* as the Emperours changed? Yea in the ſame Uſurpers time, *Baſiliſcus*, when he changed himſelf. 2. In the caſe of Images: How oft did they change in Councils, for them and againſt them, as the Princes changed? Sir, we mind this with lamentation and not inſultingly: But if you take theſe for venial little ſins, and our not ſwearing and covenanting all that you bid us for a mortal ſin, are you not partial?

2. And I would wiſh you to think on it again, before you make this guilt your own, by mincing and excuſing it; and leſt you make all other mens ſin your own, whom hereby you encourage in the imitation of them. Theſe are not things indifferent.

3. And do not ſo diſhonour Prelacy, and your Church and Diſcipline, as to tell the World that theſe in Biſhops are little things; what then is left for you to ſtick at? No man ſhould make light of ſuch Beams in the Eyes of thoſe that ſhould be the moſt pure, while they are pulling the mote of ſcrupling a Ceremony, yea an Oath. *&c.* from their Brothers Eye, and that by ſuch Iron Inſtruments as they uſe.

§ 25. Next comes his Logical terms, [*throwing dirt, outragious, bitter, malicious*, &c.] And what's the matter? [*I give not one looſe at Emperours and Courts: ſcorning to change the game, charging the Biſhops with the faults of the Magiſtrate, and laying all*

all the blame on them.] In what words? I ſay, [*ſo far could fierce, and factious Prelates prevail with a pious and peaceable Prince, by the pretences of oppoſing Hereſie and Schiſm.*

Anſ. 1. Was he not a moſt pious and peaceable Prince? Then *Socrates* that knew him, and proteſteth againſt flattery, and many others, are not to be believed? yea, if he excelled not the Biſhops?

2. Do I ſay that none but the Biſhops perſuaded him? Where do I lay all the fault on them? Do I not after name the Empereſs *Eudocia*, as the Agent to perſuade him for the Eutychians, and *Pulcheria* to perſuade him againſt *Neſtorius*: My words are viſible.

3. What Biſhops were they that perſuaded him to make a Law to confirm the *Epheſine*, Eutychian Council? Was it not *Dioſcorus* and the Eutychians? Were they not Biſhops? Did they not do it? Yea, doth not this man oft revile them far more bitterly than ever I did, and revile me for ſpeaking ſo charitably of them? Would you ever have expected that the ſame man ſhould have ſo reviled me, for ſaying that theſe Eutychian Biſhops prevailed with a good Emperour to confirm that Council of Eutychians?

4. Is it a ſin not to ſpeak hardlier of ſo good a Prince, who after repented and puniſhed his Wife and Eunuch for perſuading him? It was a blaming him to tell to what he was perſuaded.

Truly the mans anger here for my blaming the Eutychian Biſhops, in condemnation of whom he hath poured out ſo much more than I, doth make me think that there is ſomewhat in the ſound of ſome words, that turns his wrath this way or that: When he hears the name of an Eutychian, *away with them, ſpeak not eaſily of them.* When the ſame men are called Biſhops, it's *malice, outragious bitterneſs* to blame them for getting a Law to confirm that called an Heretical, Murdering, Latrocinian Council. His words are, p. 146. [*Were there ever greater violences committed than in that infamous Conventicle at* Epheſus?]

§ 26. P. 263. He confeſſeth that the *Debate between the Council and the Egyptian Biſhops was ſomething too warm*: but ſaith *that heat was not altogether without reaſon.* *Anſ.* This is his way to confeſs their faults, and then rail at me for bare reciting the words of the Debate or Hiſtory. But it *was not without reaſon*: He confeſſeth

confeſſeth not ſo much as this of the ſilencing and ruining Miniſters now. It ſhall not be the uſe of my reaſon to make Fig-leaves to cloath and cover the ſins which God abhorreth.

Men will be men he ſaith, wherever they are placed, whether in a Council or in the Church, or even at the Altar.

Anſ. By *Men* I ſuppoſe he meaneth Sinners: and it's true. But of all Sinners Oh that God would ſave his Church from thoſe who hate reproof, and cheriſh the worſt that will be for them, and excommunicate and proſecute the moſt conſcionable that will not obey them in things which they call indifferent, for fear of ſinning againſt God.

§ 27. His trifling words about *Leo* and *Rome* are not worthy of an Anſwer.

§ 28. He hath, P. 268. hit again on the overſight which I before confeſſed, even the effect of my neceſſitated haſte, that in tranſlating *Theodoret's* words I put (*truly*) in the wrong place: I ask him forgiveneſs, and the Biſhops, if that be any ſlander againſt them; which is nothing to them.

§ 29. He ſaith, P. 269. [*There is no truth in what our Author ſaith, that* Ibas *Epiſtle was acquit.*] *Anſ.* There is no truth in ſaying that I ſaid it was, when my words were disjunctive, [*The Epiſtle was acquit, or at leaſt the Biſhop upon the reading of it.*] He ſaith, *Ibas was not acquit on the reading the Epiſtle, but on the defence he made, that he communicated with* Cyril. *Anſ.* His Accuſations of Falſhood are commonly Boyiſh Quibbles. His Defence and the Reading of his Letter go together, and in *Binnius* the Letter, and the Letters of the Clergy of *Edeſſa* are the laſt things done before he is diſcharged.

§ 30. P. 270. He ſaith, [*The truth is, the* Eaſtern *Biſhops were not ſo ingenuous and fair after their reconciliation with* Cyril, *&c.*] Thus he becomes himſelf ſtill an accuſer of the Biſhops.

§ 31. Becauſe I ſay that the Judges paſt ſentence to caſt out both *Stephen* and *Baſſian* from *Epheſus*, and *all conſented*, he ſaith, [*One would think here the Judges paſſed ſentence againſt the conſent or Inclination of the Biſhops.*] *Anſ.* There is no end of anſwering your *thinkings*. I did not ſay that the Judges paſſed the Councils Sentence but their own: And whether it were againſt the *Fore-inclination* of the Council let any Reader judge, when the Judges asking the Council their ſence, [*Reſ. Epiſcopi clamaverunt, juſtitia Baſſianum vocat: Regulæ valeant.* The

Judges

Judges anſwered them that their judgment was that both were to be caſt out, and a third choſen, and the Council ſuddenly conſented. If he would be believed conrradicting this he muſt deny the Acts.

§ 32. He hath found matter for a quibble againſt *taſting* Porerius *Fleſh with their Teeth.* Teeth taſte not: Dangerous falſe Hiſtory, or want of Learning is learnedly here diſcovered. When he cannot deny the moſt woeful, calamitous diſſentions which followed the *Calcedon* Council, he ſaith, [*Was it the misfortune or the fault of theſe only not to be able to heal the differences of the Church? Or was the defect in the Councils, or the blame to be imputed to thoſe obſtinate men that oppoſed the Rule eſtabliſhed by them?*]

Anſ. No: They were neither the firſt nor the laſt that have miſcarried. Nor are we the firſt that ſuffer under ſuch miſcarriage. It was the misfortune of the Churches to have ſuch Phyſicians: But as it is the honour of ſome Phyſicians to ſhew how many Patients they have cured, ſo is it of ſome others, when moſt die under their hands, to be able to ſay, that it was long of the Patients that would not be ruled, or that they killed them *ſecundum artem.* It was a Proverb in *Sutton-Coldfield,* [*Who begun?*] A poor man had but one Aſs and he loaded him too hard, and the Aſs being in pain bit his Maſter a little on the Buttock; and his Maſter knockt him down, and killed him; and when he ſaw him dying, , [*Well,* (ſaith he) *but who begun?*] But who had the loſs? There be Clergy-Men that can impenitently ſee the *Strages,* the diviſions, the ſwarms of ſin that are the conſequents of their needleſs maſterly Impoſitions, and wipe their mouths and ſay, It was the obſtinacy of thoſe that would not be ruled by us! They kill a Flea on a mans Forehead with a Beetle, and ſay they meant not to kill the man.

But if that Councils Acts were a fit means to cure the Churches Diviſions, how came they to be preſently and through many Ages, yea, ever ſince to this day, thereby increaſed ſo many fold? Though the Aſſembly at *Jeruſalem* cured not all the Jewiſh Teachers of their blind Zeal for *Moſes* Law, it was ſo far from increaſing the Diſſentions and number of Diſſenters, that it ſatisfied the Gentile Chriſtians for the moſt part, and many of the Jewiſh, and greatly diminiſhed the Diſcord. It's one thing *not wholly to cure,* and another to *make far worſe.*

§ 33.

§ 33. He inſtanceth alſo in the *Dort Synod that made things worſe.*

Anſ. 1. The Synod of *Dort* made things the worſe in their own Country, not by their *Doctrinal Deciſions*, but by too much of the *Maſterly Spirit*, engaging the Magiſtrates againſt the *Arminians* in the uſe of the Sword. Whether it be true that they ſay, that they were neceſſitated to do what they did againſt *Barnevelt* and *Grotius* for the ſafety of their State, I am no Judge: But I am ſure it is of an ill ſound to thoſe that read it: And ſo is it to read in *Epiſcopius* and others, what violence the People have uſed againſt the *Arminians*, and they were fain to tolerate them when all was done.

And it's no wonder that the Diſſention increaſed in *England*, when the Clergy would not long ſtand to the decrees that by our own ſix Delegates were moderated: Dr. *Heylin* tells you how Biſhop *Laud*'s Zeal was the cauſe of our following Contentions: And how? By bearing down all that were againſt him.

2. But the meer *Doctrinal Decrees* of the Synod of *Dort* are ſo moderate and healing, that where Violence hath been forborn, and Reaſon uſed, many have been pacified by them. And

3. What that Synod did not, a few private Peace-makers have much done: The Writings of *Camero Amyraldus*, *Capellus*, *Placeus*, *Teſtardus*, *Lud. Crocius*, *Mat. Martinius*, *Conr. Bergius*, *Joh. Bergius*, *Blondel*, *Daile*, and above all, *Le Blanc*'s have for ought I hear, half ended the controverſie. And having my ſelf written one Book (*Cathol. Theologie*) for Reconciliation, I have not to this day had a word of Contradiction, but the Conſent of very many. And as I before noted, Is not even in *London* where other differences might exaſperate, yet this Controverſie almoſt laid to ſleep? But if our *Arminians* will but get as ſevere Laws and Canons made againſt them that are not of their Opinions, as be againſt them that dare not conform to the Dioceſane Model and the reſt, they ſhall quickly ſee this quarrel revived. The Articles of the Church of *England* determine not theſe Controverſies, and that is our Peace. Put in but one determining Article againſt either ſide, and it will break us more in pieces. Doth not our own Caſe and Experience then confute thoſe over-doing Councils?

§ 34. His next Inſtance is that of the *Weſtminſter* Aſſembly,--- *So far from reconciling the People, that after this they were diſtracted*

ſtracted into innumerable Schiſms: Never was there ſo lamentable a face of things, never ſuch variety of Hereſies, and ſuch Wantonneſs, and Extravagancy, in blaſpheming God under pretence of Religion and Conſcience: And this is the State whither the ſame manner of men are driving again.

Anſ. 1. I ſay again I knew ſo many of that Aſſembly, as that I do not think that the Chriſtian World had ever an Aſſembly of more able and truly pious Clergy-Men, theſe 1300 Years at leaſt. But theſe Upſtarts that knew them not can tell us any thing that Faction hath taught them to believe concerning them and others. The Parliament was by ſeeming neceſſity drawn to gratifie the Scots: The Aſſembly, though Conformiſts, all, ſave Eight or Nine, were as ſenſible as the Nonconformiſts of the miſchiefs of ſilencing worthy Miniſters, and forbidding Afternoon Sermons, and ſuch like; and they were as much againſt Arminianiſm and Popery as the Church of *England* was in A.Bp. *Abbat*'s days, and as much as he againſt the Doctrine of *Mainwaring* and *Sibthorp*: And the Parliament abſolutely reſtrained them from debating any thing but what they propoſed to them; ſo that they that were for the Primitive Epiſcopacy had no liberty to debate it, or ſpeak for it, but on the by. But when the Covenant was offered them againſt Prelacy, they were about to enter a Proteſtation againſt it, and were ſtopt only by limiting the renunciation to the Engliſh frame deſcribed in an explicatory Parentheſis. But for my part I think them much to be blamed, that they did not, though againſt that prohibition, reſolve to propoſe ſuch moderate healing terms to the Parliament as were agreeable to their judgments, or at leaſt have teſtified againſt the limiting of Church Concord to ſuch narrow termes, as muſt exclude ſuch men as were for the Engliſh Epiſcopacy: They might eaſily have known, that the number of ſuch in *England* was ſo great, as that an excluding Law muſt needs be an Engine of great Diviſion; and that Conqueſt will not change mens Judgments.

And as I doubt not but the five Diſſenting Independents were greatly to blame, for making ſuch a ſtir for leave to gather their Churches, when nothing was impoſed on them which they could accuſe; So I doubt not but the Aſſembly were to be blamed for making a greater noiſe againſt errours than they had cauſe for. Their deſire of Concord, which was good itſelf, did raiſe

them to too great Expectations of it, and too great impatience of little differences. They publiſhed their Teſtimony againſt the errours of the times, in which they took in Dr. *Hammond*, and made many differences worſe than they were, too like the old Hereticators. And they wanted that skill to compoſe their differences with the Independents, as was needful to that end, and might have been attained. And will the faults of that Aſſembly juſtifie the far greater faults of others? But

2. This ſort of Hiſtorians do much more differ from us about the matters of Fact, which our Eyes have dayly ſeen, yea, about our own Thoughts and Minds, than about the Hiſtory of the ancient Church. The caſe was very far different from that which he deſcribeth. Mr. *Lawſon*, a Conformiſt, ſaith, [There was never better Preaching, Piety encouraged and encreaſed, *&c.* than at that time. In all the Counties where I was acquainted, there were many young Orthodox faithful Preachers, that gave themſelves wholly to do good, for one that was ten Years before, and not any conſiderable number noted for any immorality: We were in the County where I lived almoſt all of one mind; for Epiſcopal, Presbyterians and Independents uniting in that which they agreed in, and leaving all to Liberty in the reſt, we lived in conſtant Brotherly Love and Peace without Diſſention. I never knew of any of a divers Religion in all the County, ſave at the end, in one or two corners about Twenty Quakers: And near me were about Twenty otherwiſe Orthodox, that denied Infant-Baptiſm, (and perhaps as many more in the whole County,) and Two or Three ignorant Socinians. In the next County I heard not of ſo many Heterodox: Never did I ſee, before or ſince, ſo much Love and Concord among Miniſters, and all religious People, nor read of any Age that had ſo much for 1300 Years. And whereas the common cry is, Oh, but they were all Rebels againſt the King! I have named abundance of the Miniſters in mine Apology to Dr. *Good*, (who being Epiſcopal was a Guide in our Meetings, and after ſo accuſed the Nonconformiſts) and challenged him to name one of them that ever meddled with Wars. I knew none in all the County that was in any Army ſave the King's, ſave Mr. *Hopkins* of *Eveſham* (dead) and my ſelf, and one that is a Conformiſt, and one Independent (dead.)

But it's true, that they were then ſo ſet upon Pariſh Reformation and Concord, that they were more troubled at any one that

that did turn Quaker, or againſt Infant Baptiſm, than ſome indifferent Perſons are at Multitudes. And I was one that diſputed moſt againſt them, and wrote againſt ſome diſtant Antinomians, moſtly Souldiers; But our Diſputes ſatisfied and confirmed all our Neighbours more than Priſons would have done. We puniſhed none of them, and none of our People there turned to them. But I confeſs we were commonly too little ſenſible, how much hurtful Violence hindereth Concord, more than loving forbearance of tolerable differences. As too many were how much for Peace they ſhould have abated of the Zeal for their private Opinions, which they thought to be better than they were. We were much like the days that followed the Apoſtles, which had ſome troubleſome Sectaries, but the main Body of Chriſtians did cleave together in Love, till ſucceſs had puft up a *rebellious Army* to make themſelves Rulers, to the Confuſion of themſelves and others.

§ 35. At laſt mentioning the common Diſſentions of the Churches, he ſeems to reſolve the Queſtion, *What then muſt be done?* But he puts us off only with the Negative Anſwer, that [*the Rule, i. e.* of our Uniformity *is not to be altered.* And why? [*We have no aſſurance that we ſhall find any Conformity to it more than we have now.*]

Anſ. I muſt not call this Anſwer as it deſerveth.

1. You were about dealing otherwiſe with the Papiſts: Dr. *Heylin* tells us how much they were to have altered for Concord: Mr. *Thorndike* threatens the Land, if you alter not the Oath of Supremacy for them: The name of the Pope and Anti-Chriſt hath been expunged for them; yet you ſaid not, *We know not that they will come any nearer us.*

2. By theſe meaſures a Rag or a Ceremony ſhould never be abated for the Peace and Concord of any Church or Kingdom: You may ſtill ſay we are not ſure that this will ſerve them. The Pope may ſay ſo, where he refuſeth to abate the ſhaving of the Prieſts Beards, or the leaſt of his Impoſitions; yea he knows that would not ſerve. They ſaid ſo to the *Bohemians* four Demands: They concluded ſo at firſt againſt *Luther.* This very Argument hath kept them from all Reformation.

3. Can you find nothing in your Impoſitions that in the nature of the thing is worthy to be altered? If not, you have more or leſs Wiſdom than Biſhop *Morton*, and the reſt of the Church

Doctors who at *Weſtminſter* motioned ſo many Alterations. If one ſhould but then move you to correct your known falſe Rule for finding *Eaſterday*, or to give Parents leave to be the firſt Promiſers for their own Children, and Godfathers but their ſeconds, or not to deny Chriſtendom and Communion for that or a Ceremony: No, come on it what will, nothing muſt be altered, leſt men ask more. And yet you preach againſt Clergy Infallibility, (or ſubſcribe at leaſt.)

4 But if you are ſo much againſt altering, why did you alter to our greater ſuffering, and add as much more (yea five times more) to the former Task and Burden? You can no doubt ſay ſomewhat for all this.

5. And when it is the ſame things that the old Nonconformiſts ſtill asked, and we ſince 1660 askt yet leſs, what reaſon had you to raiſe that ſuſpicion that we will not be ſatisfied with what we ask? Have we given you any cauſe? If you mean that perhaps there be ſome ſtill that may be unſatisfied, will you deny Peace to ſo many that beg it of you, becauſe others will not accept it on their Terms? Or will you never agree with any leſt ſome diſagreement ſhould ariſe hereafter.

Some Travellers were aſſaulted by the high way by a Captain of Souldiers, who took all their Money, Swords and Horſes, and ſwore he would kill them if they would not take an Oath to conceal him: One took the Oath to ſave his Life, another ſcrupled it: They begg'd his Mercy to reſtore ſo much as would bring them home: He askt them what would ſatisfie them: One would have his Horſe, another his Sword, another part of his Money. He told them, *You are a Company of Rogues, that can neither agree what to ask, nor give me aſſurance if I give you this you will ask no more.* I compare not the Authority but the Reaſons of the Denial.

§ 36. But ſeeing no abatement of their Canons, *&c.* muſt be granted, what is it that muſt cauſe our Concord? He would not tell you; but it's diſcernible what's left: It muſt be *no Concord* but what Puniſhment can procure: And what puniſhment? Sharper than is yet tried; for that hath not done it: Such Concord as *Tertullian* nameth, *Solitudinem faciunt & pacem vocant*: The Concord in *Spain* is worſe than the *Amſterdam* toleration.

Again I remember the great Fiſh-Pond mentioned by Judge *Hale*, that had multitudes of Fiſh and frie; and at laſt two ſmall

ſmall Pikes put in; when the Pond was drawn there was never a Fiſh but the two Tyrants (as he calls them) grown to a huge bigneſs. The fear leaſt *Popery* and *Prelacy* ſhould be the two Pikes, tempted men irregularly to covenant againſt them. To have ſuch variety as Roch, Dace, Pierch, Tench, Carp, made it a Schiſmatical Pond; The two Pikes were againſt Schiſm and Toleration, and for ending the Diviſion by reducing all to unity of Species.

§ 37. As to his Queſtion of Qu. *Elizabeths* days, the Intimation may ſeduce the ignorant, but none elſe. 1. If he know not that it was the Subſcription required in the Canons, (that *nothing in the Books is contrary to the Word of God*, ſcrupled, which broke the Peace and Concord of *England*, he is unfit by his Ignorance to be an Informer of others. I have known many that would have yielded to come into the Conforming Church, if *that one word* had been but forborn: For when any practice againſt their Conſciences about baptizing, Communion, or Burials had faln in their way, they would have ſilently ſhifted it off, or been from home, and have ventured to anſwer it, ſo they could but conſcionably have got in. But our Canoneers are for all or nothing.

2. He is ſure no Engliſh Clergy-man, if he know not how much is laid on us, that was not known in the days of Qu. *Elizabeth*. Is it to inform men, or deceive them, that he makes the difference to be between 36 and 39 Articles, and ſaith nothing of all the new Covenants, Declarations, Oaths, Subſcriptions, Doctrine and Practiſes?

§ 38. Many make uſe of Mr. *Edwards Gangrena*, and *the London Miniſters Teſtimony againſt errours*, to prove the Hereſies and Confuſions of the late times. No doubt all ſin is odious: But few men living are more competent Witneſſes of thoſe things than I. The Errours that ſprung up were much more tenderly reſented then than now. You now have many called Wits and Perſons of Quality, who at a Club diſpute againſt the Providence of God, the immortality of the Soul, and a future Life; and there is neither Church-Admonition, Excommunication, nor any great matter made of it, but they are Members of the Church of *England*, the pureſt Church in all the World: Whereas in thoſe licentious times, if one Souldier had ſpoken ſuch a Word, it would have rung out through the Land, and perhaps his Tongue would

have

have been bored with an hot Iron. It was the errours of the proud rebellious Soldiers that made moſt of the noiſe, that had no conſiderable number of Miniſters left with them. I had a hand in Mr. *Edwards* Book thus: An Aſſembly of Miniſters after *Naſeby* Fight ſent me into the Army to try if I could reduce them. Dayly diſputing with them, a few proud ſelfconceited Fellows vented ſome groſs words. At *Amerſham* a few Country Sectaries had ſet up a Meeting in Dr. *Crooks* Church, to diſpute and deceive the People: A few of Major *Bethel's* Troop (that afterwards turned Levellers and were ruined) joined with them: I met them, and almoſt all day diſputed againſt them, and ſhamed them, and they met there no more. I gathered up all the groſs words which they uttered and wrote them in a Letter to *Francis Tyton*, and after I found them cited in Mr. *Edwards Gangrena*. And what's the abſurd Speeches of a few ignorant Souldiers, that are dead with them, to the Hereſies and Schiſms that theſe 1000 or 1200 Years continue in all the Roman Communion, and they ſay in all the reſt of the Chriſtian World. One cheating Papiſt as a converted Jew got into an Anabaptiſts Meeting, one *Maxwell* a *Scot*, and all *England* rung of it. But when Biſhops have made and keep *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, &c. in the ſame Errours, Dr. *Heylin*, and Bp. *Bromhall*, and ſuch others, took them for ſuch, with whom a Coalition on the terms by them deſcribed was very deſirable.

CHAP. XXIV.

His 7th Chapter conſidered.

§ 1. THE Man had not the courage to defend the ſurgent Prelacy in its Manhood and Maturity, but only in its Infant and Juvenile State; nor to defend the many hundred Councils which I mentioned after the Council of *Calcedon*, in which either his Modeſty or Cauteloufneſs comes ſhort of his Rd. Fathers, who ſome of them own the ſix firſt General Councils, and ſome of them eight, and ſome would unite with the Church of *Rome*, if they will abate but the laſt 400 Years additions.

§ 2. In

§ 2. In his Gleanings in this 7th Chap. he over, and over, and over perſuadeth his Reader, that I make or affirm that [*the Bps. were the cauſe of all the Hereſies in the world, and of all the Hereſies, Schiſms, and Evils that have afflicted the Church.* And hath this Hiſtorian any proof of this? Or is it the melancholy fiction of his Brain? Yes, this is his proof contrary to my manifold Inſtances, becauſe I ſay in one age, [*We have a ſtrange thing, a Hereſie raiſed by one that was no Biſhop*: which I have anſwered before. To be *then ſtrange*, and *never to be at all*; are not words of the ſame ſenſe? But his Anſwers throughout do mind me of *Seneca*'s Words, that a man that is ſore complains (or cries Oh) when he doth but think you touch him.

§ 3. He thus himſelf accuſeth the Biſhops, *p.* 276. [*There have been wicked men and wicked Biſhops in all times.*] And p. 277. [*That ſome Biſhops have abuſed their Authority and Office, and been the cauſe of Hereſie and Schiſm cannot be denied.*] But yet [*He hath ſhewed ſufficiently, that moſt of my particular Accuſations are void of all truth and Ingenuity.*] *Anſ.* Or elſe thoſe words are ſo.

§ 4. He ſaith *All Eccleſiaſtical Writers agree, that* Simon Magus *was Author of the firſt Hereſie in Chriſtian Religion.*] *Anſ.* All confeſs that *Judas* was before him: And if it be a Hereſie to buy the Spirit for Money, it is a Hereſie to ſell Chriſt for Money. But I confeſs ſome tell us of his after pranks at *Rome*, and imitating *Icarus*, at *Peters* Prayers: If you would ſee why Dr. *More* takes this for a toyiſh Legend, ſee his *Myſtery of Iniquity*, Lib. 2. C. 19. § 6, 7. p. 447, 448.

§ 5. P. 286, 287. *Baronius* firſt, and *Philaſtrius* after, are made guilty of Forgery and diſregardable Hiſtory, ſo that I may well bear ſome of his Cenſures.

§ 6. P. 290. To confute me effectually he ſaith much what the ſame which is much of the ſum of all my Book: And yet it's falſe and malicious in me, and true and charitable in him: *viz.* [*Praiſing the firſt* 300 *years*, (when the Biſhops were ſuch as we offer to ſubmit to:) he adds [*The following Ages were not ſo happy; but as Chriſtians generally degenerated ſo did the Biſhops too.*]

Anſ. What! Before the Council of *Nice!* That's a ſad Confeſſion. I was ready to ſay as a Roman Emperour ſaid to a flatterer, that ſtill ſaid all that he ſaid, [*Dic aliud aliquid ut duo ſimus,*]

mus,] But his next words allay it, [*But yet not ſo much as our Author would make it appear.*] As the Dominicans and Oratorians muſt ſay ſome falſhood of *Calvine*, leſt they be thought Calviniſts.

And yet he addeth, [*The beginning of the 4th Century was very unhappy to the Church, for Perſecution without, and Hereſie and Schiſm within.* Meletius *an Egyptian began a Schiſm, forſook the Communion of the Church*, &c. *Next the Donatiſts, Arians*, &c.]

Anſ. It ſeems that the Emperours *Conſtantius* and *Valens were without the Church, and yet the Arian Prieſts and Biſhops were within it.* When he defineth the Church we may underſtand this. But is it not this 4th Century that is made the Churches more flouriſhing ſtate by others?

§ 7. Even the great Hiſtorian of Hereſies, *Epiphanius*, is ſaid p. 292. to be [*unaccountably miſtaken in ſeveral things relating to that Hiſtory.*] And 293. hath [*a ſtrange unaccountable miſtake in diverſe other things relating to that matter.*] If I had at any time erred with ſuch a Biſhop and Father, I might have been excuſable for reciting his Hiſtory.

§ 8. Pag. 295. He opens the very Heart of his Parties Principles, and ſaith, [*The Church is never diſtracted more by any thing than Projects of Moderation.*]

Anſ. Experience proveth that you ſpeak your Heart. The words are no wilful Lye which agree with a mans Mind, be they never ſo falſe as diſagreeable to the matter. No man was more of that Opinion than *Hildebrand*, that would not yield the Emperours the Inveſtiture, nor as I before ſaid, abate the Prince of *Calaris* the ſhaving of his Biſhops Beard to ſave his Kingdom. *Victor* began with that Opinion too ſoon, but his Succeſſors have theſe Thouſand Years been as much for it as you can wiſh.

2. But to whom is it that you intend this? Sure not to all: Was Biſhop *Laud* of that mind toward the Papiſts if Dr. *Heylin* ſay true? Was *Grotius* of that mind toward them? Was Arch-Biſhop *Bromhall*, *Forbes*, *Beziar*, *Thorndike* (and many more ſuch) of that mind? No: I'le excuſe you, that you meant not them and their *Projects* of *Moderation*: Nor I believe neither *Caſſander's*, *Eraſmus's*, *Wicelius's*, *Sancta Clara's*, *Leander's*, &c.

But towards ſuch as I am, you have been as firm to that Principle as any one of our Enemies could wiſh. In 1660, 1661. it

was

was moſt effectually improved; and you have attained much of the fruits then foretold: and ever ſince have been unmoveably and prevailingly true to it.

3. But this maketh ſome men the *Diſtracters of the Church*, if not the *greateſt*, which truly I have better thoughts of: Such as *Junius*, *Paræus*, *Amyraldus*, *Le Blanke*, *Davenant*, *Ward*, *Uſher*, *Holdſworth*, *Morton*, *Hall*, &c. And lately when we were preparing for the Kings Return, Bp. *Brownrig*, and after his death Dr. *Gawden*, Dr. *Gulſton*, Dr. *Allen*, Dr. *Bernard*, and diverſe ſuch did offer themſelves to a Treaty for Moderation: And ſince then Dr. *Wilkins*, Dr. *Burton*, Dr. *Tillotſon*, and *in diebus illis* Dr. *Stillingfleet* have been guilty of this crime, of *diſtracting the Church by projects* of Moderation: But I can name the Bps. that were not guilty of it.

To abate or forſake the neceſſary points of Faith and Practice on pretence of Moderation, is to deſtroy Chriſtianity on pretence of Humanity or Peace. But to make Laws that men ſhall preach with Horns on their Heads, to ſignifie the Victory of Truth, and to ruine all that will not keep theſe Laws (much more if men ſhould command worſe) and to ſay a Project for Moderation would diſtract the Church, would be as far from Wiſdom as it is from Moderation: And ſome Prelates have done as bad as this.

§ 9. He confeſſeth *p.* 296. that by force and Fraud [*the whole World in a manner was turned Arian.*] And did I ever ſay worſe of the Biſhops than this?

§ 10. He maketh *Aerius* to ſpeak againſt Biſhops becauſe he could not be a Biſhop, ſo that he was of a Prelatical Judgment and Spirit, and calleth him [*The Cartwright of the times,*] by which if he mean that Cartwright would have been a Biſhop, it doth but tell us that he deſerveth little belief in his Hiſtory.

§ 11. He is a moſt ſingular Hiſtorian, *p.* 303. in telling us, that after the Monothelites *in following Ages of the Church the Devil ſtarted up but few Hereſies till theſe Ages,--- Swenkfeldians, Anabaptiſts*, &c.

By this I perceive he believeth neither Papiſts nor Proteſtants: For the Papiſts name many Hereſies ſince, and the Proteſtants ſay that Popery is but a Compoſition of many Hereſies, and name us many that concur'd thereto.

§ 12. He there giveth me this ſerious Admonition, [*It is a much greater wonder that any man that makes Conſcience of what he ſaith, ſhould againſt all truth of Hiſtory, and againſt his own knowledge, charge the Biſhops with all the Hereſies in the World: that a perſon that ſeems ſo ſenſible of approaching Judgment, as frequently to put himſelf in mind of it---ſhould yet advance ſo malicious and groundleſs an Accuſation. There is no dallying with the all-ſeeing God---What Plea ſhall be made for whole Books full of Calumny and Detraction*, &c.]

Anſ. This is not the leaſt acceptable paſſage to me in his Book; I love the man the better for ſeeming ſerious in the belief of Judgment; and I hope his Warning ſhall make me ſearch my Heart with ſome more jealouſie and care. He ſeems here to believe himſelf; but being my ſelf far more concerned than he is to know how far I am guilty of what I am accuſed, as far as I can know my Heart and Writings, I'le tell the Reader what to judge of his words and me.

1. That I *charge the Biſhops with all the Hereſies in the World*, never was in my mind, nor can I find it in any of my Writings: Yet this he very oft repeateth: And ſhould a man ſo often write a falſhood about a thing viſible, and never cite the place where I ſay it, and this while he is thus ſeriouſly mentioning *Calumny* and *Judgment*.

2. Can he make men believe at once that I do perſuade men that Biſhops or Dioceſanes came not up till about 150 years after Chriſt, and yet that I make them the Authors of the Hereſies that were in thoſe times? *Non entis non eſt actio*: Could Biſhops be Hereticks when there were no Biſhops?

3. If I had *charged the Biſhops with all the Hereſies*, it followeth not that I had charged no one elſe with them, and made the Biſhops the ſole Authors, and acquit People, Prieſts, and Princes; why then doth he name many Monks and Prieſts that were Hereticks? Or Emperours that promoted them, as if this croſſed what I ſay? Did he think that I excluded the Army if I blame the General, or the Prelatical Prieſts when I blame the Prelates? If I took the Biſhops of *England* to be the chief cauſe of our Church-Schiſms, and Calamities, doth it follow that I acquit ſuch as you, and all the Clergy like you?

4. That I have done this [*againſt all Truth of Hiſtory*] which I tranſcribed out of the Councils and Hiſtorians moſt partial for the

the higheſt Prelacie, is either a great untruth, and unproved by him, or I know not what I read or write.

5. That I do this againſt my own Knowledge I am certain is an untruth.

6. That my Accuſations are *malicious* I am *certain* is untruth, as being able to ſay that I ſpeak in pitty to the Church, and to ſave Souls from deceit, and malice no man; but pray with the Liturgy, that God will *forgive our Enemies, Perſecutors, and Slanderers, and turn their Hearts.*

7. That I have brought any *Groundleſs Accuſation* I muſt take for an untruth, till my Grounds produced are better confuted.

8. Much more that I write *whole Books full of Calumny and Detraction.*

All theſe and more untruths being heapt up with the mention of Death and Judgment, tells us whither Faction and Prepoſſeſſion may carry men.

2. But what is the truth I ſhall again briefly tell the Reader: 1. About 2000 of ſuch Miniſters as I confidently take for the moſt ſpiritual, and conſcionable and devoted to God and the good of Souls are ſilenced, and in Law impriſoned and ruined; and all the People of their mind are *ipſo facto* (if they confeſs it) excommunicated, beſides their other penalties. I accuſe not the Law but mention only the matter of Fact, which the K. once commiſſioned Bps. to have prevented.

2. The Kingdom is dolefully divided, and alas, the ſad conſequents are not to be named.

3. Beſides all our Penalties the Biſhops accuſe us as the cauſes of all, and as wilful Schiſmaticks, and call for the Execution of the Laws againſt us.

4. We ſay, we dare not do that, which when ever they will give us leave, we are ready to give our reaſons why we take it for heinous ſin againſt God, and tending to the ruine of the Church: nor dare we forſake our Miniſtry while the Churches neceſſities are to us paſt doubt.

5. We beg of them but to abate us ſome needleſs Oaths, and Covenants, and Profeſſions, and a few things called *indifferent* by the Impoſers, that we may all live in Chriſtian Love and Peace, and we offer them as unqueſtionable ſecurity for our Peaceableneſs, Loyalty, and Orthodoxneſs, as the ſaid Oaths, Promiſes, or Profeſſions can be.

6. They tell us, *Nothing is to be abated us, and we muſt ceaſe preaching, the Rule muſt not be altered; we will do more harm in the Church than out; Projects for Moderation moſt diſtract the Church; There is no Concord or Liberty to be expected, but by our total obedience to the Biſhops; It is obeying the Church, yea the Univerſal Church of Biſhops, that is the only way to Concord.*

7. To confute this Suppoſition, which is the root of our Calamities, I tranſcribe out of Hiſtory and the Acts of Councils, how great a hand in the Schiſms, and Hereſies, and Confuſions of Chriſtians, thoſe Biſhops have had, who have ſwelled up above the primitive ſpecies, by vaſt Dioceſſes, Wealth, and claim of Government over other Churches and Biſhops; and that it is notorious that this Grandeur and exorbitant power of Biſhops, ſingly or in Councils, hath been ſo far from keeping the Church from Schiſms, that it hath been one of the greateſt cauſes of the Schiſms of moſt Ages, ſince ſuch a ſort of Prelacy ſprung up, and that Popery came not up in a day, but roſe from that Juniority to its preſent Maturity. This was my work.

§ 13. He truly tells you, that the *Original of all miſchiefs is the Luſts that war in our Members, and not this or that Order of Men.*]

When the World had a good Pope, if God would bleſs that Order of men, ſome think he might do more good than any other man. But he hath toucht the Core of the Churches Malady. Verily, the grand Strife is between the *Fleſh* and *Spirit*, the ſeed of the Serpent and of the Woman: And if Patriarchs and Dioceſans were but as much ſet on the promoting of a holy and heavenly Life, as thoſe Miniſters are whom they ſilence and impriſon, they might do much good, though the largeneſs of their Dioceſs render them uncapable of performing the 40th part of a true Biſhops Work. No doubt but Biſhop *Hall*, and *Potter*, and *Uſher*, &c. did much good, by ſuch preaching, writing, and good living, as others uſe that are no Biſhops.

But will fire burn without fewel? And will it not burn if combuſtible fewel be contiguous? Do not the *Luſts that war in our Members* live upon that food which we are forbidden to provide? Do you think that the *Luſt* of the Fleſh doth not more deſire Riches than Poverty, Honour than a low Eſtate, Domination over others, to have our Will on all, than humble Subjection? Where the Carkaſs is there will the Eagles be gather-

ed

ed. Do not you your ſelf ſay, that the Biſhops and Church grew more corrupt after the third Century? Do you believe that when a Biſhops Power was made equal to a great Lords, or more, and all his Pomp and Riches anſwerable, that the Luſt of the Fleſh would not more greedily deſire it, than it would deſire a meer mediocrity? Or that a worldly proud man would not ſeek more for Lordſhip and Greatneſs, than a *Syneſius*, and ſuch others as you ſay fled from it? If the poor retired Monks were as bad as you make them, what wonder if great Lordly Biſhops were much worſe? Will not the fire of Luſt grow greater as the fewel is greater?

I am ſatisfied that Riches and Power well uſed, may greatly ſerve the Intereſt of Religion: But two things muſt be conſidered.

1. That the *greateſt Power and Wealth* being far more deſired by carnal Worldlings, (that is, by bad men) than by mortified heavenly minded men, the more men deſire them, the more eagerly they will ſeek them by Friends, Flattery, or any means: and therefore the liker they are to attain them, except when the chooſers are ſome reſolved godly men. And ſo which way can a Succeſſion of the worſt men be avoided? But a mediocrity that doth not to the Fleſh overweigh the labours and difficulties of the ſacred Office, will encourage the good, and not much tempt the bad: Or if good men will be never ſo bountiful to pious uſes, their bounty and Church-Lands may better maintain Labourers enough for the work, than be made a ſnare to one.

2. And that Power which depopulateth and deſtroys its end, is unlawful in its very ſtate, as well as in its uſe. The Power of one man to be ſole Phyſician to the City, and to have none but Apothecaries under him; or of one man to be the only School-Maſter in the County, and have none but Uſhers under him, is rather to be called *Deſtruction* than *Power*. It is Biſhops caſting out Power that I am againſt, that is, the neceſſary Power of the Keys in the Pariſh Miniſters, or putting down neceſſary Biſhops; and alſo a Power to ſilence Chriſts faithful Miniſters, and deprive Souls of the neceſſary means, by impoſing things needleſs in themſelves, and ſinful in the receiver, that after his beſt ſearch believes them ſuch.

Seeing then that we are agreed, that it is the *Luſt that warreth*

reth in men, that is the corrupter of the Church, let but the face of the whole Romane Clergy theſe 1000 Years at leaſt tell us, whether it be not the ſwelling of the Power and Wealth of Biſhops, that hath cauſed ſo long a Succeſſion of a worldly, luſtful, tyranical Clergy.

§ 14. And he truly ſaith, [*p.* 306. that the *generality of men when they have gained Wealth and Honour, are commonly willing to ſecure the enjoyment of thoſe Poſſeſſions, by letting things run in their ordinary courſe.*

(The Spaniſh Proverb is, *The World is a Carryon, and they are Dogs that love it*, and they will ſnarle at any that would take it from them, and if it lie in the Ditch, Dogs rather than Men will gather about it: and its pitty ſuch men ſhould by ſuch a Bait be tempted into the ſacred Chair.) And he truly adds, that *Repulſe and Diſappointment will end ſuch mens Patience.* For really as the man is, ſuch are his deſires: It is not only turgent Prelacy but a Prelatical Spirit that troubleth the Church: And If *Novatianus* or *Arius* would fain be a Prelate, it is in his heart; and no wonder if he be a Schiſmatick; *Trahit ſua quemque voluptas.* Appetite is the Spring of Action. All the Popes Clergy are much of his mind; for they participate of his worldly Intereſt, and depend on him, and therefore participate of the Papal Spirit. The Intereſt of the General and Army are conjunct.

§ 15. And its true that he ſaith, that *the Biſhops Intereſt obligeth him to maintain Peace and Unity.* And ſo no doubt from that ſenſe of Intereſt it is endeavoured, in *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, *Germany*, &c. when a ſtrong man armed keeps his houſe, the things which he poſſeſſeth are in Peace. But whether therefore the People did ill that forſook the Biſhops and followed *Luther*, or are all bound to cleave to the Biſhops Unity, is the doubt.

§ 16. Whether it be true, *p.* 310 that *very few if any one were Biſhops when they turned Hereticks*, I have enquired in the Preface; though if they aſcended from Hereſie to Prelacy it's all one to me. But by this I conjecture that he taketh fewer for Hereticks than others do, and that he pretends acquaintance with their minds, in that antecedent part of their Lives which no Hiſtory mentioneth. I confeſs I think that for the moſt part men are Papiſts before they are Popes or Papiſt Biſhops: And yet I think that it is firſt the *deſire of Papal and Prelatical Grandeur*;

deur, and next the *Exerciſe of it*, which is the cauſe of Schiſm and Perſecution.

§ 17. I verily believe as he doth, that Platonick Philoſophy, and a willingneſs to win the Heathens by compliance, had a great hand in corrupting many Doctrines; and not only Monks but others of the moſt religious Chriſtians, had a great hand in many of the ancient Superſtitions, eſpecially thoſe that tended to the over-honouring of their Martyrs, and too much advancement of their Biſhops, when they came newly from under the Perſecution of the Heathens. But it came not to be univerſal, nor the Engine of great Corruption and cruelty, till the Biſhops turned all into a Law. Who could make any of all this neceſſary, but Pope, Prelates, or Princes, who pretended a Legiſlative Power hereto? Even *Luther* and *Melanctbon* were indifferent to diverſe Ceremonies, ſo they were made to be indifferently uſed. But when they are made neceſſary by a Law (ſpecially more neceſſary to a Miniſter than his Miniſtry, and to a private Chriſtian, than his Church Communion, who doth more vehemently condemn them than they?

§ 18. That *Paſchaſius Radbertus* was the firſt that broached the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, is a doubtful expreſſion. Either he meaneth the *Name* or only the *Thing* under another Name. If the latter, he will do more than *Edm. Albertinus*, or Bp. *Conſius* have done, if he prove it: If it be the name that he meaneth, I think (by my Memory, for I will not for that go read him all over) that he will not find the name in *Radbertus*, nor any where before *Stephanus Eduenſis*, about 130 years after him: and that all that he can truly ſay, is but as *Bellarmine* doth, [*Hic Author primus fuit qui ſeriò & copioſè ſcripſit de veritate Corporis & Sanguinis Domini in Euchariſtia contra Bertramum Preſbyterum.*

§ 19. *That the Biſhops charged* by me *with theſe Corruptions, were the only Oppoſers of them that we find in antiquity, as we may ſee in the Canons of* Africk *and* Spain,] is a ſaying very near kin to much of his Hiſtory: I confeſs that ſo few Presbyters in compariſon of Biſhops were publick Actors, whoſe Judgments were notified to the World, that it's no wonder (after *Conſtantine*'s time) if there be more proofs of their words and deeds than of other mens: But there are a great number of excellent men here ſlandered againſt the credit of all Church-Hiſtory, and

their

their own Writings yet in our hands. Would it be worth the Readers Price and Labour, I could ſwell my Book with the proof that what he ſpeaketh is untrue. Did he think that I could not prove that *Juſtin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origene, Arnobius, Lactantius, Macarius, Maternus Firmicus, Ephrem Syrus, Fauſtinus, Hierome, Ruffinus, Prudentius, Sulpitius Severus, Sedulius, Mammertus, Caſſianus, Vincent. Lirinenſis, Socrates, Sozomen, Iſodore Peluſiota*, &c. did ſomething in oppoſition to ſome Church-Corruptions? Though ſome of them promoted ſome others: Yea, *Antonie* and abundance of Monks that furthered ſome, oppoſed others no leſs dangerous: Though many of them may be accuſed as *Bellarmine* doth *Sulpit. Severus*, for ſaying, *Eccleſiam auro non ſtrui ſed deſtrui.*

Judge of time paſt by what we ſee; Is it *only* the Biſhops that are againſt the Popes Church-Corrupting Uſurpation in *Italy, Spain, France*, &c. Is it *only* the Biſhops that are againſt the Maſs Corruptions, and againſt all their corrupt Doctrines of Indulgences, Purgatory, Images, *&c.* and againſt all their Ceremonies, and prophane abuſe of holy things? Was it only the Biſhops at *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, that were againſt ſuppreſſing the Bohemian and Moravian Reformation? In the end of *Lydius* upon *Prateolus* you may read a Letter ſubſcribed by ſo great a number of Lords and great men, for *John Hus*, and *Hierome*, and the Reformation, which yet prevailed not with the Biſhops, as will tell you who was then the greateſt Oppoſers of Church-Corruption. And I think Princes and Drs. oppoſed it more than Bps. in *Luther*'s time. Is it only the Biſhops that have oppoſed warping towards *Rome* for Church-Unity? Have none but Biſhops been againſt corrupting the Churches, by ſilencing good Miniſters and ordaining bad ones? The things that are, have been. I confeſs our difference is great on the caſe, *what is to be accounted Church-Corruption.* For that which in one Country goeth for Corruption, in another (yea the ſame) goeth for *Church-Glory, Strength, and Beauty*; Our main difference is about what's good, and what's bad; what's Virtue, and what's Vice.

§ 20. He next comes to *Sedition*, and asketh [*What Reign have they diſturbed here with their Sedition?*] And becauſe he knoweth that I can refer him to the large Volume of their Treaſons written by *Prin*, and abroad to the many Volumes in *Goldaſtus*,

daſtus, and the many Hiſtories of the Wars of Popes and Councils againſt Emperours,] he prevents all my Proof with a downright Untruth, that ["*If a man be not blind he may ſee that my* "*Hiſtory is only deſigned againſt Proteſtant Biſhops under a general* "*name.*

Anſ. Was it not enough ſo groſly to write this Untruth of me, but he muſt alſo reproach all the Readers as blind that will not judge falſly of what they read? Doth he know my meaning better than my ſelf? He knoweth that I plead for the Primitive Epiſcopacy, and that I profeſs to intend this Hiſtory moſt to diſcover the Riſe, Growth, and Maturity of the Popiſh deſtructive ſort of Prelacy. Readers, can you believe this man, that I wrote the caſe of the Biſhops before and under Popery, and of the Popes, and of above Five hundred Councils, and all theſe before the name of a Proteſtant Biſhop was known in the World, and as he ſaith, gathered their faults, and all this only againſt the Proteſtant Biſhops, and not againſt Popes or Prelates, or any of the Councils that I named?

Perhaps he would tempt me to refer him to the Hiſtory of Biſhop *Laud*'s Trial, or to what Biſhop *Abbot*, *George* and *Robert*, Biſhop *Hall* and others ſaid againſt him: Or to tell him of A. Bp. *Williams* Arms for the Parliament. But theſe are not Subjects fit for our Debates.

§ 21. *P.* 318. When I ſay, that *where Prelacy with the Papiſts is at the higheſt, Princes are at the loweſt.* He asketh, *Is it the Biſhop or the Papiſt that is here to blame? Is this the effect of their Order?*

Anſ. 1. I thought the Pope of *Rome* and the Biſhop of *Rome* had been the ſame. 2. But this Corrector of Hiſtory taking Untruths not only into the *Completion*, but the *Stamina* and Scope of his Book, among all the reſt ſuppoſeth me to ſpeak againſt *a Biſhop as a Biſhop*, when I have troubled him with my repeating ſo often that I *am for Biſhops*, and that it is not the *Office* but the *tumor*, and that *tumor* that maketh another *ſpecies* which I oppoſe. Doth he not think that the Popes Biſhoprick is faulty (yea, as a *corrupt ſpecies?*) And as it is more *tumid* than the *Patriarchs*, is not the *Patriarchs* more *tumid* than the *Metropolitanes*, and that than the *Dioceſanes?* And if Dr. *Hammond* were not deceived, who thought that *there were no ſtated worſhipping Aſſemblies in Scripture times without a preſent*

Biſhop, is not the *ſole Biſhop* of a Thouſand or a Hundred ſuch Aſſemblies different from a Biſhop of *One only?* And if many Canons ſpeak truly, that ſay a Biſhop ſhould be in *every City* that hath a *Church*, and every great Town like our Corporations and Market Towns was called a City, doth not a Biſhop of one City, and a Biſhop of 50, or 40, or 10, differ ſo far, that a man may be againſt one without being againſt the other? Doth he ſpeak againſt Patriarchs that ſpeaks againſt the Pope? Or againſt Dioceſanes that ſpeaks againſt Patriarchs? Or againſt the Primitive Biſhops that ſpeaks only againſt ſuch Dioceſanes as put them all down, and all their Churches, and almoſt all true Diſcipline of ſuch Churches, like *Eraſtians*.

§ 22. *P.* 319. 322. His Charge on *Socrates* and *Sozomene* (ſhaking the credit of Church Hiſtory) as writing that [*which no reaſonable man can believe as it is related by them, without loving a malicious Lye.*] I ſpake to before: If ſuch Hiſtorians *believed* not what they write or *loved a malicious Lye*; alas, whom ſhall we believe? Is he better than they?

And his note that *Valeſius* judged *Euſebius Nicomed* no *Heretick*, I before noted.

But I will follow that caſe no further, leſt he ſhould draw me to ſeem to charge the ancient Biſhops with ſedition, whom I never intended ſo to charge; but only to deſire thoſe that can excuſe the Language *e. g.* of *Gregory* the great to *Phocas*, of *Ambroſe* to *Eugenius*, of the Biſhops to *Maximus*, and many ſuch like, not implacably to reproach and hunt thoſe that did no more or not ſo much.

§ 23. His full Stomach diſchargeth itſelf againſt me three times over with one charge, *P.* 314, 320, 352. [Oliver Cromwell *and his Son, the* David *and* Abſalom *of Mr.* B.] And [*He compares the moſt barbarous villain in the World to King* David, *in his Epiſtle to his Son.*

Anſ. Reader if there be no ſuch word in any of my Writings, after all theſe Accuſations of this man and many ſuch other, I muſt leave it to thy ſelf how thou wilt name theſe men, their Hiſtory, and their dealings; for if I name them they will ſay I rail.

Yea, what if this very man (it's eaſie to know why and whence) doth even here, *p.* 352. *&c.* reprint the very Epiſtle which he thus accuſeth, and cite no ſuch word, to tell us that he

he knew there was no such word there, and yet thus affirmeth it, what will you call this?

The words cited by himself are these, [" *Many observe that* " *you have been strangly kept from participating in any of our late* " *bloody Contentions, that God might make you a Healer of our* " *Breaches, and employ you in that Temple Work, which* David " *himself might not be honoured with, though it was in his mind, be-* " *cause he had shed blood abundantly, and made great Wars.* 1 *Chr.* 22. 7, 8.]

Had I said what is this Week published, as one of their chief Dr's Elegy upon Oliver Cromwell, *(with two others) what should I have heard? What abundance of Conformists flattered* Oliver, *while I openly disowned him as a Usurper, but now their malice hath got the handle.*

Is here ever a word of *Oliver?* Is he here called *David?* Did I not purposely say, [*David himself*] and cite the Text, lest any should feign the same that he doth? Any man may see that he hath nothing to say, but to accuse my Thoughts, and suspect that I had such a meaning. And who made him acquainted with Thoughts that were never uttered? Or made him a Judge of them? If his and other mens thoughts may be thus by conjecture accused, no Enemy need to want matter of Accusation.

It's like he will appeal to my Conscience whether it were not my thought? And 1. By what authority will he so do? 2. But I will shrive my self to him this once. It is so long since, that truly I remember not what was in my Thoughts, any further than my words express: But I well remember my *former Actions*, and what was then *my judgment of* Oliver and his Actions, and I use not to speak against my judgment. Many knew that he being acquainted the first day that I went into the Army, (which was after *Naseby* Fight) that I was sent by an Assembly of Divines, to try whether I could turn the Soldiers against his subverting Designs, (then first discovered to me,) he would never once speak to me while I was in the Army; and that ever after I was driven away, I openly in Pulpit, Press and Conference disowned, and warned men to disown his Actions against King and Parliament, and his Usurpation; and that I wrote against the Engagement: And therefore I do not think that ever I meant to call him *David*, and I am sure I never *did it*. But they say old Men can see better afar off than near at hand; and so all these notorious Untruths about visible present things, may yet consist with such mens credibility about things said and done 1300 Years ago.

§ 24. And now I am here, I must not pass by his friendly Admonition, *p.* 357. after his reciting my Epistles, [" *If I were as*

" *worthy to adviſe Mr.* B. *as he was to adviſe* Cromwell, *I would* " *ſay, It were much more adviſeable for a Chriſtian, ſpecially for* " *one that thinks he is ſo near his eternal State, to repent and cry* " peccavimus, *than to ſtand on Juſtification of the fact*, &c.]

Anſ. 1. Is was uſual for men to chooſe their own Confeſſours: But it being the Cuſtom of the times for Paſtors and Confeſſors to be forced on Diſſenters, I will ſubmit now to your way, though my former Confeſſions and my Communion with you have been turned to Reproach and Scorn.

1. I do daily beg earneſtly of God, to let none of my ſins be unknown to me, and taken for no ſin, and be unrepented of; and that he would forgive that which I would fain know, and do not.

2. I do not repent of owning *Oliver*'s Actions againſt King and Parliament, or his Uſurpation; for I never owned them, nor the Actions of them that ſet up his Son.

3. I do not repent that I loved the Peace of the Church, and that I deſired the Governour, though a Uſurper, ſhould do good and not evil.

4. I do not repent that ſeeing the Armies Rebellions and Confuſions, I ſtirred up Rulers and People to take heed of favouring ſo great Sin.

5. But I do now by experience of other ways perceive that I was ſometimes too eager in aggravating mens Errours, and repent that I uſed not more forbearance of ſome of my Accuſations of ſome of them.

6. I did think that *Richard Cromwell* was an Uſurper: But when we had been twelve Years at leaſt without a rightful Governour, I then thought as *Thomas White*, alias *Blacklow*, the moderate Papiſt, wrote, that the Land could not ſubſiſt in Society without ſome Government, and that *No-Government* is worſe to the People than a *Uſurped one*: And that it is ſomtime lawful to *ſubmit* and *uſe* an Uſurper, when it is not lawful to approve his Entrance. And wherein I was deceived I am willing to be better informed.

7. But I do unfeignedly repent that I wrote thoſe two Epiſtles, though it was to put a man on to do good, whom I *never ſaw, nor ever had the leaſt to do with.*

8. And I do more repent of the cauſe of all, *viz. that I appointed God a time,* and limited his Providence; and thought that

that becauſe ſo many Armies and Endeavours had failed Twelve or Fourteen Years, that had attempted the reſtoring of the King, therefore there was no probability of accompliſhing it: I do not repent that I was not a Prophet, to know before what God would do; for it was not in my power; nor do I repent that I preached Chriſts Goſpel under Uſurpers; but I repent that I waited not Gods time, and did not better conſider that want of humane Power is no hinderance to Omnipotency, and nothing is difficult to him.

9. I was drawn too far by Mr. *Harringtons* Scorn, and the diſlike of Sir *Henry Vane*'s Attempts for a Common-Wealth, to meddle with matters of Government, and to write my Political Aphoriſms, called, *A Holy Common-Wealth*: And I do unfeignedly repent that ever I wrote and publiſhed it, and had not more confined my ſelf to the matters proper to my Calling, and let thoſe meddle with forms of Government who were fitter for it.

All theſe, beſides what's formerly ſaid to Mr. *Bagſhaw*, I declare my unfeigned Repentance of. And though it pleaſeth you to feign me a Schiſmatick, and hater of Repentance, (for ſpeaking againſt the fault that needed it) I ſhall thank you to be a real helper of me in ſo neceſſary a work as Repentance is.

And that I may do the like by you, I ſhall now only requite you with this Advice, that before you write next, you will ſet before your Eyes the Ninth Commandment, *Thou ſhalt not bear falſe Witneſs againſt thy Neighbour*: And that when you ſay your Prayers, you would be ſerious when you ſay, *Lord have Mercy upon us, and encline our hearts to keep this Law.*

§ 25. A Roman Zeal tells us, that Faction and Schiſm, when animated by worldly Intereſt, and grown up to a malignant hatred of the things and perſons that are averſe to it, is hardly bounded, but is thriving up towards deſtructive Perſecution, as ſwelling Prelacy did towards the Papacy and the Inquiſition. It is not one or two Fiſhes that will ſatisfie the ſtomach of a Pike: Nor is it the ſlandering or ruining of one or two men, or ſilencing of one or two of the Miniſters of Chriſt, that will ſatisfie a malignant Spirit. One Meal will not make a lean Man fat. Whether there be a Legion in thoſe that would deſtroy a Legion of Chriſts Servants, or one have ſo much Power I know not; but the effects tell us *what manner of Spirit they are of.* But let the Papiſts paſs.

§ 26.

§ 26. When I read *p.* 337, and 358, 359. and such passages, it makes me think of them that cried, [*His Blood be on us, and our Children,*] together with our Judge's words, [*In as much as you did it or did it not to one of the least of these my Brethren, you did it or did it not to me.*] P. 337. he saith, [" *There is great* " *reason to value the peaceable Resignation of the Nonconformists,* " *when we consider by what Usurpation and Violence they were brought* " *in, and what a number of worthy learned Ministers were turned* " *out to make vacancies for these men, who were to instruct the Peo-* " *ple in new Mysteries of Religion, which their old Pastors had not* " *the Conscience or Ability to teach them, that is, of the lawfulness* " *of Rebellion.*--- And p. 358, &c. *There were many of those Mini-* " *sters Usurpers, and had intruded into the Churches of other men,* " *who had been silenced and cast out.*--- *There were many others that* " *were intruders into the Ministry, and such not a few of them as* " *Mr.* B. *himself would not have thought fit to have continued. All* " *the rest were such as would not submit to the Rule that was then* " *established in the Church, but chose rather to leave their Livings,* " *and the Bishops could not help it, any otherwise than as they were* " *Members of Parliament; for it was the Law that tied them to* " *their choice, and not the Bishops. If Mr.* B. *means what happened* " *before the last Civil Wars, as it's likely he may, then these ancient* " *Teachers were the instruments of an Antimonarchical, Antiepisco-* " *pal Faction: They would preach but they would not conform to the* " *Established Religion: Nay many of them would preach against it,* " *and against their Governours too. These were such Incendiaries as* " *no Government would endure,* &c.]

Ans. When you have noted this part of his History, it will not be hard to judge of his credibility.

I. The things that he defendeth is the silencing and prosecuting of three sorts of Ministers. 1. Many Hundreds of Nonconformists in the days of Qu. *Eliz.* K. *James*, and some few in the time of K. *Charles* 1. 2. Many Conformists in the time of K. *Charles* 1. under Bishop *Laud.* 3. About 2000 that conform not to the New Laws of Uniformity in the time of K. *Ch.* 2. What these Ministers were or are, and what the fruits of their silencing have been, and what it hath done to the Church of *England*, and to many Thousands of Godly Christians, I will not be judge: Nor will I dispute that which all *England* sees or feels. But it seems so well done to our Historian, as that he is willing

willing deliberately to juſtifie or defend it, which as I underſtand is to make it his own, and to undertake to be one of thoſe that ſhall anſwer for it. What if another had done as much againſt him, as he hath done againſt himſelf? And for how ſmall a prize?

II. As he before would inſinuate, that what is ſaid of the great number of Drunkards, and ignorant men turned out, was falſe, though ſo judged upon the Oaths of men accounted the greateſt lovers of Religion in their Pariſhes; ſo he ſeemeth here to intimate that it was only or chiefly into the places of learned worthy men, that the ſilenced Miniſters ſucceeded; whereas it was not one of many that came into any ſuch mens places of them that were ſilenced at the fatal *Bartholomew* day.

III. He ſeemeth to intimate, that when the Parliament (ſuppoſe by wrong) put out either ſuch as he or I deſcribe, the Land muſt be under an Interdict till the Biſhops and King were reſtored, and that Chriſts Goſpel was no more to be preached in *England*, till Dioceſanes returned, but all Souls be given up to Damnation, unleſs Chriſt would ſave them without the preaching of his Goſpel, and the Land was to be left to the Devil and Paganiſm. And who can deny now but the *Dioceſane Species* is *eſſential* to the Church?

IV. When I ſpake only of the ſilencing and ejecting Act, of *Aug.* 24. 1662. he would make the Reader believe, that this Change was to reſtore the Churches to their ejected Paſtors, or caſt out Uſurpers; whereas unleſs Ignorance or worſe hinder him, he knoweth that all that were caſt out and were alive, laid claim to their Benefices, and were reſtored before that, and their Livings reſigned quietly to them, to ſay nothing of the reſt that were ſuppoſed to be at the Lord Chancellors diſpoſal. Thoſe that were put out that the ſequeſtred might re-enter, were none of them ſilenced, nor made uncapable of other Livings till *Auguſt* 24. 1662.

V. He would inſinuate that it was only the *Nonconformiſts* that were caſt out of ſuch ſequeſtrations: Whereas in the Countries that I either lived in or heard of, it was as many or more of the Conformiſts, that had ſequeſtred Livings and were caſt out, and took new preſentations.

VI. And this is evident by his Intimation, as if it were a very great number of the Church Livings that were ſo poſſeſt:

Whereas

Whereas of Nine Thousand or Ten Thousand Ministers then in Possession, Seven or Eight Thousand Conformed: Therefore it's likely that the Conformists had most of the Sequestrations.

VII. He tells you that the Ejected Ministers were brought in to instruct the People in the Lawfulness of Rebellion: Doth not this intimate that this was the case only or chiefly of the silenced Nonconformists? But I have oft cited *Jewel* defending the French Protestants; Was not he a Bishop? I have oft cited *Bilson*, affirming it no Rebellion if the Nobles and People defend their Legal Constitution against one that will--- (I will not recite the rest.) ------ I have oft cited *Ri. Hooker* whose popular Principles I have confuted, and goeth higher against absolute Monarchy, than I or any of my Correspondency did in all the Wars. *Heylin* is for Conciliation with the Papists: He knoweth not their Writings who knoweth not that the Papists are more for popular Election, and Power towards Princes, far than ever such as I were. And had he not put his Head and Eyes into a Bag, he could hardly have denied but that they were Episcopal Conformists on both sides that began the War: But being got into the dark he loudly denieth it.

VIII. He saith, *There were many others that himself would not have thought fit to have continued. Ans.* I thought I was more likely to know them than he. I remember not one such of an hundred that did not conform. I confess that when the Prelatical party intreated me no longer to refuse the *Westminster* Commissioners Letters, deputing me with others to try and judge of some Episcopal Conformists that stood then for Livings, to avoid all seeming opposition to that way I did stretch as far as I durst, to approve and keep in some Conformists, of very low parts who knew not a quarter so much as some Lay People did: But none of these were Nonconformists.

IX. He saith, [*All the rest were such as would not submit to the Rule then established in the Church.* This is true: And what was that Rule? Did *Peter* or *Paul* make it, or submit to it? Did they refuse any thing that God commanded in Nature or Scripture? Or any Circumstantials necessary *in genere* left *in specie* to the Magistrates determination? They were guilty of believing that God is above man, and that there is no Power but of God, and none against him; and that we must please him whoever

whoever be diſpleaſed. They were guilty of ſo much Self-love as to be unwilling to be damned for a Benefice, or for a Biſhops Will. They did not conſent to profeſs Aſſent and Conſent to all things contained in and preſcribed by three Books, written by ſuch as declare themſelves to be fallible; and ſuch as not one of Fourty ever ſaw before they declared the ſaid Aſſent and Conſent to them. They did not conſent to caſt out all Infants from Chriſtendom, whoſe Parents durſt not offer them to Baptiſm, under the Sacramental Symbol of the Croſs; nor unleſs they might have themſelves been Covenanters, Undertakers, or Promiſers for them, as well as the Godfathers: Or that ſcrupled getting Strangers to undertake that perfidiouſly for their Children which they never intended to perform. They durſt not read Excommunications againſt Chriſts true Servants, nor repel thoſe from Chriſtian Communion, who ſcruple kneeling in the reception of the Sacrament: They durſt not ſwear that many Thouſands whom they never knew are not obliged by the Covenant, when they know not in what ſence they took it: For they are not willing to believe that the compounding Lords and Knights did not put a good ſence on it before they took it. They durſt not ſay that all is ſo well in our Church Government by Dioceſanes, Lay-Chancellours Power of the Keys, Archdeacons, Officials, Commiſſaries, *&c.* that we may ſwear againſt all endeavours to amend it by any alteration; They do believe that the Law of Nature is Gods Law, and that as it alloweth a ſingle Perſon only private defence, ſo it alloweth every Nation publick defence againſt Enemies notorious deſtroying aſſaults: And they dare not ſwear or covenant, that if any ſhould from the Lord Chancellour, *&c.* get a Commiſſion to ſeize on the Kings Navy, Treaſures, Forts, Guards, Perſon, and to ſeize on the Lives and Eſtates of all his Innocent Subjects, that it is unlawful to reſiſt any that execute ſuch a Commiſſion. They find it ſo hard a Controverſie, what God doth with the dying Infants of Atheiſts, Infidels, Mahometanes, and Perſecutors, that they dare not declare, that if any of their Children be baptized and die, *it is certain by the word of God that they are undoubtedly ſaved.* We ſay not that the Law binds us to any of the evil which we fear: But we dare not take Oaths and Promiſes which we underſtand not.

Abundance I pretermit.

He is extreamly cenſorious if he think that Mr. *R. Hooker*, Bp. *Bilſon*, Bp. *Grindal*, A. Bp. *Abbot*, Bp. *Rob. Abbot*, Bp. *Jewel*, &c. would have been Conformiſts had they been now alive.

X. He ſaith, [*They choſe rather to leave their Livings.*] *Anſ.* They choſe not to conform, but ſubmitted only to leave their Livings; *Eligere eſt agere.* They were paſſive in this, they refuſed to conform as ſuppoſed by them a heinous Sin, but they choſe not to be ſilenced or caſt out; but they *choſe* to *endure* it when the Biſhops choſe it for them.

XI. He ſaith, that [*the Biſhops could not help it any otherwiſe than as they were Members of Parliament.*

Anſ. 1. I confeſs Scripture uſeth the like Phraſe, *Can the Leopard change his Spots*, &c. or they that are *accuſtomed to do evil learn to do well?* And Rom. 8, 6, 7. *The carnal mind is enmity againſt God, for it is not ſubject to his Law, nor can be.*] I will not here too much contradict him, 2. But is it nothing that they could have done in Parliament, had they been willing? 3. Is it unlawful for us to know if he know it not, or deny it, how much the Biſhops and Clergy did with the Parliament-Men? 4. He ſhould at leaſt have ſtayed till Dr. *Bates*, Dr. *Jacomb*, and I are dead, who wrote and diſputed with the Biſhops by the Kings Commiſſion, before he had talkt at this rate to the World. Did not the King make his Declaration about Eccleſiaſtical Affairs? And did he not under the broad Seal commiſſion thoſe Biſhops and Doctors to treat with us for the *making ſuch alterations as were neceſſary to tender Conſciences?* Did they not maintain that *no alterations were thereto neceſſary*, and ſo end the treaty. 5. Did they not in their next Convocation lay aſide the Kings Indulgent Declaration, and make the Additions to the Liturgy? And yet could they not help it? Nor was it none of their doings? 6. Doth not *England* know that Parliaments ſince have by experience perceived their Miſtake, and would have ſuſpended our Proſecution, and reſtored us to Unity, and the Biſhops and Clergy will not conſent but rage againſt it, and preach and write to have us executed according to the Laws, and no abatement to be made, and as this man, think that the Churches *Diſtraction* is from *Projects of Moderation.* What name ſhould one give to ſuch Hiſtories as theſe? The guilty cannot bear their names.

XII. He

XII. He ſaith, [*It was the Law that tied them to their choice and not the Biſhops.*

Anſ. 1. Suppoſe the word *choice* were proper here, [Is it any juſtification of the Executioners?] It was the Emperour *Charles* the 5th's Edict that tied all the Proteſtant Miniſters to conform to the *Interim*, or be gone: It was the Law that tied the Martyrs in Qu. *Maries* days to profeſs what they believed not, or to be burnt. Alas! How could *Bonner* and *Gardiner* help it? 2. But how many Biſhops were againſt the paſſing of that Bill? And who perſuaded the Lay-Men to it? Muſt we not know when it's night if you deny it?

XIII. He tells you, that [*the ancient ſilenced Teachers before the Civil Wars, were the Inſtruments of Antimonarchical and Antiepiſcopal Faction.*

Anſ. 1. Which of them all ſaid ſo much as Mr. *Hooker*, Bp. *Bilſon*, Bp. *Jewel*, &c. have done? 2. If you make any Conſcience of the 9th Commandment, prove the Truth of what you ſay of thoſe that were ſuſpended and driven out of the Kingdom in the times of A. Bp. *Laud*, Bp. *Wren*, Bp. *Piercy*, &c. for not reading the Book for Lords-days Dancing and Sports, and that were proſecuted for Preaching twice on the Lords-day, and for not turning the Table Altar-wiſe, and railing it in, which even Bp. *Montague* as well as *Williams* was againſt. Was Biſhop *Miles Smyth* of *Glouceſter*, were A. Bp. *Abbot* or *Grindall Antimonarchical* or *Antiepiſcopal*? 3. Prove if you are able any Antimonarchical Principles, Words, or Deeds by Mr. *Hilderſham*, Mr. *Brinſley*, Mr. *Paul Baine*, Mr. *Dod*, Mr. *Knewſtubs*, and hundreds of ſuch I might name. The moſt malicious are fain to talk of one *Knox*, or one *Goodman*, or one *Junius Brutus*, (that is, *Hubertus Languetus Melanchthons* friend) or ſomewhat in *Buchanan*, not the tenth part ſo much as is commonly ſaid by the Papiſts, with whom our A. Bp. *Bromhall* and his Companions ſo much plead for Concord. 4. Doth not *Al. Cope*, and *Sanders*, and *Pateſon* in the *Image of both Churches*, and lately the nominal *Bellamy* in his *Philanax Anglicus*, and many more ſuch, ſay all the ſame of the Biſhops and Church of *England*, and all that they deride as [*Proteſtants of Sincerity*] as guilty of far more rebellious Principles and Practices, than ever you can prove by the meer Nonconformiſts old or new? And is it enough to accuſe?

XIV. He ſaith, *They would preach but they would not conform to the eſtabliſhed Religion.*

Anſ. 1. But why ſhould they be forbidden to preach (which was good and they were devoted to?) If a man will not *do all* that you would have him to do, ſhall he *do nothing?*

2. What was that which he calleth the *Eſtabliſhed Religion?* It was the Ceremonies and Subſcription, *that there is nothing in the Liturgy contrary to the Word of God.*] And was this a Crime worthy the forbidding men to preach the Goſpel? Or why ſhould the Souls of Thouſands of the Innocent People be ſo heavily puniſhed for another mans omiſſion, even becauſe the Teachers fear Conformity.

3. But ſtill we ſee what theſe mens *Religion* is: Had their Religion been the Scripture, or any Doctrine or Worſhip common to the Chriſtian or Proteſtant Churches, the old Nonconformiſts willingly conſented to it. But here they ſhew that their Ceremonies and proper Liturgy forms are their Religion. But then 1. Why do Dr. *Burges* and all that plead for your Ceremonies and Invention, build all on this, that you make them not any parts of Worſhip or Religion, (which they confeſs man may not invent) but meer accidents? 2. How *old* then is *your Religion*? Your Liturgy was made ſince *Luther* began his Reformation. 3. It ſeems then that you are not of the ſame Religion with the Proteſtants that have none of your Ceremonies, Liturgy or Subſcriptions. 4. Is not then your Church of a ſingular Religion from all the World, and conſequently a ſingular Church? And is it the whole Catholick Church then, or a Schiſmatical Church?

I confeſs that you ſhew more evidently than by ſuch words, that your ſelf made Rules and Circumſtances are your Religion: For 1. You make Conformity to them to be *de facto* more neceſſary than *our* Preaching the Goſpel, or *our* Church Communion, or any publick Church Worſhip of God. 2. And you excommunicate by your Rule or Canon every Member of Chriſt in *England*, that doth but think and ſay, that any thing of your Impoſition, Liturgy, Ceremonies, or Government are ſinful. 3. And yet when you have done you call all your Impoſitions *things indifferent*. 4. And thereby you declare that your *Religion* in part is a thing *indifferent*. 5. And no Man or Woman ſhall be of your Church that cannot know *all the in-*

different

different things in the *World* which may be impoſed on them, to be *Indifferent* and not *Unlawful*; when you know (or you know not whom you dwell among) that we have much adoe to get one half your Church to know *things neceſſary*. 6. The Papiſts that put a greater neceſſity on their Inventions will deride you for an *Indifferent Religion*.

There was a poor Puritane Nonconformiſt that feared Lying, that went about the Streets with Ink to ſell, and was wont truly to cry, [*Very good Ink, very good Ink*;] but once his Ink a little miſcarried, and he durſt not call it [*Very good*,] but cried, *Pretty good Ink, Pretty good Ink*,] and no body would buy of him, and he loſt his Ink. And if you cry up [*An indifferent Religion*,] whatever you have for numbers, you will have for quality but an *Indifferent Church*, (ſave our Rulers.)

XV. But he adds, [*Many of them would preach againſt it and their Governours too.*]

Anſ. 1. You tempt them towards it. If I ask the Butcher [*Is your Meat ſweet?*] and he ſay it is *indifferent*, I am excuſable if I think it ſtinks. 2. They judge by the effects: They thought that when an *indifferent* thing caſteth out a neceſſary thing, it becomes naught. 3. But yet your Accuſation is unfaithful: Why did you not ſay then, that it was not for *Nonconformity* that men were caſt out, but for *preaching againſt your Religion?* Who were thoſe? Was it proved? If ſo, what was that to the reſt? Do you puniſh many learned moderate men for the fault of a few others that they were not concerned with? You now alledge Mr. *Hilderſham, Ball, Bradſhaw, Baine, Knewſtubs*, and abundance ſuch, for being againſt *Separation*, and perſuading men to come to the Common Prayer, (and many of them to kneel at the Sacrament,) and yet when you plead for their Silencing, even other mens words may ſerve againſt them.

XVI. To conclude, in all he layeth the cauſe of their ſilence on themſelves for not conforming, and yet will not tell us what we ſhould do to help it. Would they have us Conform while we judge it as ſinful as I have mentioned in my firſt *Plea for Peace*? No; they profeſs the contrary. Would they have us believe all to be lawful? We cannot: Our Judgments are not at our Command: What would they have us do to change? Worldly Intereſt maks us too willing! We ſtudy as hard as they!

We

We earneſtly beg Gods Illumination to ſave us from Error We read all that they write to convince us: And the more we read, ſtudy, and pray, the more heinous the Sin of Conformity ſeems to ſome. I askt Bp. *Morley* the ſame queſtion when he forbad my preaching, before the ejecting Act; and he bid me read *Bilſon* and *Hooker*: I told him that was not now to do: and in both of them I found the Principles which are made the cauſe of my Silencing, my greateſt Crimes, and in one of them worſe. He then told me, *If God would not give me his Grace he could not help it*: And yet moſt of theſe men are againſt *fatal, reprobating, neceſſitating Decrees.*

The impoſing Papiſts uſe men worſe: Of whom will you pardon a Fable.

A *Bee* and a *Flie* were catcht together in a Spiders Web: The Spider when they were tired with ſtriving, claimed them both for her Food, as a puniſhment for breaking into and troubling her Web: And againſt the Bee ſhe pleaded that ſhe was a hurtful Militant Animal, that had a Sting; and againſt the Flie that ſhe was noiſome and good for nothing. The Bee anſwered that her mellifying Nature and work was profitable, and Nature had armed her with a Sting to defend it. And the Flie ſaid, as ſhe did little good ſo ſhe did little harm, and could make her ſelf no better than Nature had made her. And as to the Crime alledged againſt them, they both ſaid, that the Net was made by a venomous Animal, ſpun out of the Air and the Venom of her own Bowels, made for no uſe but to catch and deſtroy the Innocent, and they came not into it by malice, but by ignorance and miſtake, and that it was more againſt their Will than againſt the Spiders, for they contrived not to fall into it; but ſhe contrived to catch them; and that it was not to break the Net that they ſtrove, but to ſave their Lives. The Maſter of the Houſe overheard the Debate, but reſolved to ſee how the Spider would judge, which was quickly done without more words; ſhe took them for Malefactors, and killed them both. The Maſter of the Houſe ſo diſliked the Judgment, that he ordered that for the time to come, 1. The Bees ſhould be ſafely hived and cheriſhed. 2. And the Flies, if not very noiſome, ſhould be tolerated. 3. And all Spiders Webs ſwept down.

I need to give you no more of the Expoſition of it, than by the *Spider* I mean the Papal noxious Canon-makers, and that by the

the *Net* I mean their unneceſſary and enſnaring Laws and Canons, which are made to catch and deſtroy good men, and are the way to the Inquiſition, or *Bonner's* Coal-houſe, or *Smithfield* Bonefires. But I muſt deſire you not to imagine that I ſpeak againſt the Laws of the Land.

§ 27. As to the Concluſion of his laſt Chapter, I ſhall now add no more but this: If what I ſaid before and to Mr. *Hinkley* ſatisfie him not, of what Religion and Party both ſides were that began the War, and Mr. *Ruſhworths* Collections, and other Hiſtories of former Parliaments be not herein uſeful to him, let him but ſecure me from burning my Fingers with Subjects ſo red hot, by mens miſinterpreting and impatience, and I will (God willing) give him ſo full proof, that (to ſay nothing of latent Inſtigators and conſequent auxiliaries on either ſide, nor of the King himſelf, whoſe Religion is beyond diſpute,) the parties elſe that begun the War in *England* did differ in Religion; but as A. Bps. *Laud*, and *Neal*, and *Bromhal*, and ſuch others, and A. Bps. *Abbot* and *Williams*, and Bp. *Bilſon*, on the other ſide; and as Dr. *Mainwaring*, *Sibthorp*, &c. on one ſide, and Mr. *Ri. Hooker* and ſuch on the other ſide differed. And if my proof be confutable I will not hereafter undertake to prove that *Engliſh* is the language of *England*.

But my Bargain muſt be thus limited. 1. I will not undertake that from the beginning there was no one Papiſt on the Kings ſide, or no one Presbyterian on the Parliaments: I could never yet learn of more than one in the Houſe of Commons, and a very few Independents, but I cannot prove that there was no more.

2. You muſt not put me upon ſearching mens hearts: I undertake not to prove what any mans heart in *England* was; but what their Profeſſion was, and what Church they joined with in Communion.

3. And you muſt not equivocate in the uſe of the name [*Presbyterian*,] or [*Nonconformiſt*,] and tell me that you take ſome A. Bps. and Bps. and ſuch Divines as *Ri. Hooker*, and *Bilſon*, and Bp. *Downame*, the Pillars of Epiſcopacy and Conformity, for Presbyterians.

And if it may be I would beg that of you, that you will not take the long Parliament for Presbyterians and Nonconformiſts, who made the Acts of Uniformity, the Corporation Act, the Militia

Militia Act, and those against conventicles, and for banishment from Corporations, &c. Notwithstanding their high Votes about the Succession and Jealousies of Popery, and that which they said and did hereupon: For I confess if it be such Nonconformists or Presbyterians as those that you mean, I'le give you the better. And I must also desire that you call not the next Parliament, which consisted most of the same Men, Presbyterians or Nonconformists; nor the other since them? Or at least that hereafter before we dispute we may better agree of the meaning of our terms.

And I declare to the Reader, that nothing in all this Book is intended against the Primitive Church-Government or Episcopacy, nor against the good Bishops, Clergy, Councils, or Canons, which were many; nor against King, Parliament, Magistracy, the Laws, or Liturgy, or Church Communion; nor against our peaceable and patient submission where we dare not practically obey: But only against the diseases and degeneracy of Bishops, Clergy, Councils, and Canons, and those dividing practices, by which they have for 1200 Years and more been tearing the Christian World into the Sects of which it now consisteth; and against the whole ascendent Change from the Primitive Episcopacy to Papal maturity: and against our swearing, Subscribing, declaring, covenanting, professing, and practising, where we understand not the Imposers sense, and are unwilling by our private Interpretations to deceive them, and where we are perswaded that it would be heinous sin to us, not meddling with the case of Lawmakers or Conformists, who have no such fears, but think all good.

Chrysostome (before cited) in *Act.* 1. *Hom.* 3. *p.* (*mihi*) 472. speaketh harder than I ever did: [ὐκ ἀλλως λέγω, &c. which *Erasmus* translateth, [*Non temere dico, sed ut affectus sum & sentio; Non arbitror inter Sacerdotes multos esse qui salvi fiant, sed multo plures qui pereant.* His reason is the same which some give why they think most Physicians kill more than they cure, because there is so much Wisdom, Goodness, Watchfulness, and Diligence required to their Calling, which few of them have.

Luther is much sharper than I ever was, when he saith, [*Hieronymus & alii Patres vixerant in temporali Successione Ecclesiæ, expertes Crucis & persecutionis. Episcopi enim jam tum cœperant crescere & augeri opibus, existimatione & gloria in mundo: Et plerique*

rique etiam tyrannidem exercebant in populum cui præerant, ut teſtatur hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica: Pauci faciebant ſua Officia, &c. Loc. Com. 4. Claſſ. p. 79, 80.

Et Cap. 27. p. 48. de Synodis. *In poſterioribus Conciliis nunquam de fide, ſed ſemper de opinionibus & quæſtionibus diſputatum* (after the firſt) *ut mihi Conciliorum nomen pene tam ſuſpectum & inviſum ſit, quam nomen Liberi arbitrii.*

What *Melancthon* thought of the Papal deſign of magnifying Councils, and pleading the neceſſity of uninterrupted Succeſſion of Epiſcopal Ordination, ſee in his Epiſtles, eſpecially of the Conference at *Ratisbone*.

Dr. *Henry Moore* in his *Myſtery of Iniquity* ſaith, p. 132. ["That Principle tends to the ruining of Faith, which ſup- "poſeth that without right Succeſſion of Biſhops and Prieſts, "there is no true Church, and therefore no true Faith: and "that this Succeſſion may be interrupted by the Miſordination "or Miſconſecration of a Prieſt or Biſhop, the Perſons thus or- "dained being Atheiſts or Jews, or ordained by them that are "ſo---- As if a man could not feel in his own Conſcience whe- "ther he believed or not the truths of holy Scripture, without "he were firſt aſſured that he was a Member of that Church, "that had an uninterrupted lawful Succeſſion of the Prieſthood "from the Apoſtles times till now.

Perhaps *Epiſcopius* and *Curcellæus* will be more regarded. Read that notable Preface of *Curcellæus* to *Epiſcopius* Works, p. 12, 13. [*Reſp. Experientiam docere nullas unquam Controverſias de Religione inter Chriſtianos exortas auctoritate ſynodali feliciter terminatas fuiſſe---& certiorem multo pacis viam eſſe-----* Next he ſhews how little good even the *Nicene* Council did, and how much worſe things were after: *Hierome* ſaying, that the whole World was Arian, And *Conſtantius* reproaching *Liberius* for being with one man againſt all the World: The Vulgar *Dicterium* being, *Omne Concilium parit Bellum.* Whence he gathers that Councils, ſuch as the World hath hitherto had, *non eſſe idoneum componendis Religionis diſſidiis Remedium: Et quamdiu illud uſurpabitur perpetuas in Eccleſia &* Republica *turbas fore.*

Epiſcopii & præcipuorum emicuit fides & animi magnitudo, quod ne promiſſo quidem ſolutionis ejuſdem quo antea fruebantur ſtipendii, induci potuerint ut ſe ad ſilentium quod imperabatur ſervan-

dum obſtringerent, etiamſi nonnulli in magna rei familiaris anguſtia verſarentur.

So copious and ſharp is *Epiſcopius*, Qu. 52. p. 56. b. in maintaining that the Magiſtrate hath no Authority to forbid ſacred Aſſemblies to tolerable Diſſenters, and that Miniſters and People forbidden them muſt hold on to the death, that I will not recite the words, but deſire his Admirers to read them.

An

An Account to Edward *Lord Biſhop of* Cork *and* Roſſe *in* Ireland, *of the ſucceſs of his Cenſure of* Richard Baxter *in* England: *Detecting his manifold Untruths in matter of Fact.*

§ 1. TO give my Character of you whom I know not, as you do of me, is none of my work: But 1. Your *Stile* alloweth me to ſay, that by it you ſeem to me to be a man of Conſcience, fearing God. 2. And yet your *Matter* aſſureth me, that you ſpeak abundance of Untruths confidently; I ſuppoſe, partly by not knowing the perſons and things of which you ſpeak, and partly by thinking that you ought to believe the falſe Reporters, with whom you are better acquainted.

§ 2. The ſtrait which you caſt us into is unavoidable: Either we muſt ſeem to own all the falſe Accuſations brought againſt us, which will hurt others far more than us; or elſe we muſt deny and contradict them, and that will paſs for an intolerable addition to our guilt, and we ſhall be ſuppoſed ſuch intemperate, fierce abuſive Perſons as you deſcribe me, while you think we give you the Lye, or make you Slanderers. But we cannot cure your Miſreſentments, but muſt be content to bear your Cenſures, while we call you not Lyars, but only acquaint you with the truth.

§ 3. For my own part my final Judgment is ſo near, and I am conſcious of ſo much evil in my ſelf, that I have no reaſon to be haſty in my own Vindication, but much reaſon to take all hints and helps for deeper ſearch, and will not juſtifie my Stile. And God knows I am afraid leſt ſelfiſhneſs or partiality ſhould hinder

me from finding out my ſin: and I dayly and earneſtly beg of God to make it known to me, that I may not be impenitent: But either Prejudice, Converſe, or ſomwhat elſe, maketh a very great difference between your Judgment and mine, of Good and Evil: And I cannot help it: If I err it is not for want of willingneſs to ſee my Errour, and openly retract it; nor for want of an ordinary Diligence to know the Truth.

The Sum of our difference, as far as I can underſtand you, is in theſe particulars.

I. Whether there be no ſin impoſed by the Laws or Canons on Miniſters and People here?

II. Whether it was well done by the Biſhops and other Clergy-Men to do what they did to cauſe thoſe Laws, which ſilenced the whole Miniſtry of *England*, unleſs they would conform to all things ſo impoſed in the Act of Uniformity; and actually ſilenced about 2000, and made thoſe other Laws againſt their Preaching to more than Four, and againſt coming within Five Miles of Corporations, and ſuch others, as adjudge Nonconformiſts to Gaols and Ruine; and whether the Clergy do well ſtill to urge the Execution of thoſe Laws, and are guiltleſs of the doleful Diviſions of this Land, and danger of its Relapſe to Popery?

III. Whether it be unpeaceable for a Nonconformiſt after 17 years ſilent ſuffering, to tell his Superiors why he dare not conform, when he is by them importuned to it? And to write a Confutation of a multitude of Volumns of falſe Accuſations brought to juſtifie the Executions?

§ 4. If you think you have proved all thoſe Impoſitions ſinleſs which I have mentioned in my firſt *Plea for Peace*, I think you might as well have ſhortly ſaid, [*We Biſhops are of ſo much Wiſdom and Authority, that you muſt hold them lawful, becauſe we ſay ſo.*] And muſt all be ruined that would not be ſo convinced? But if any of thoſe Impoſitions prove to be ſin, and ſo great ſin as we cannot chuſe but think they are, is it a greater fault to name them (when importuned) than to impoſe them? And a greater fault to feel, and ſay we feel, than to ſtrike or wound men?

If we had taken it to be our Duty to have called thoſe Clergy-Men to Repentance, which we think are ignorantly undoing themſelves and the Land, how ſhould we do it without naming

naming their Sin? Yea, and the greatneſs of it? And if we think it our Duty to deprecate our Deſtruction, and beg of you to ſpare our Lives or Conſciences, how can we do it without telling what we ſuffer? If it be well done of you, and be no perſecution, but your Duty for the Churches good, (as no doubt the Executioners think) the Hiſtory is your praiſe, and you need not extenuate the Fact: Valiant Souldiers glory in the multitudes they kill: Had you ſilenced the other 7000 that conformed, when you ſilenced but 2000, your Victory had been the more famous. Some think thoſe that are here againſt your ways, are not half the Land; were it murdering of one man, that another is judged for, it were not unpeaceableneſs to ſay, that he deſerveth to be hanged: But the judge deſerveth praiſe if he condemn an hundred ſuch. But when thoſe men who ſhould be the tendereſt Peace-makers, and skilfulleſt therein, ſhall be the men that bring ſuch a Land as this into the Caſe that we are in, and will not be intreated, nor by any Experience be perſuaded to conſent to its Relief, I know not how to ſhew mercy to the Land or them, but by perſuading them to repent. And if all ſin were made a matter of Controverſie, and many learned men were for it, this would not alter the Caſe with me. If I may compare great things with ſmall, who ſinned more? The *Iriſh* for murdering 200000, or Sir *John Temple*, Dr. *Henry Jones*, the E. of *Orery*, for recording and reporting what they did? Was it the ſin of the *Savoyards* and others to kill and ruine the Proteſtants in *Piedmont*? Or of *Perrin*, and Sir *Sam. Mooreland* to write the ſtory? Did *Thuanus*, *Davilah*, &c. ſin in recording the *French* Maſſacre? Or the *French* in doing it? Is it the *French* Proteſtants now that are criminal for deſcribing and complaining of their Sufferings? Was *John Foxe* the Malefactor for writing the Sufferings of the Proteſtants under a lawful Queen? This day came out (*Mar.* 10.) a Narrative from *Briſtol* how they are crowded in the Gaol on the cold ground, *&c.* Is the Report the Crime? Do you find a Juſtification in humane nature of ſuch terms as theſe, [*You ſhall ſuffer whatever we will inflict on you, but ſhall not tell any that you are hurt, or who did it, or why*?]

§ 5. I have told the World ſo often over and over, that it is not all the Conformiſts, no nor all the Biſhops that I impute our Sufferings to, that I muſt ſuppoſe you to underſtand it, ſpecially when the Prefatory Epiſtle of the Book which you fall upon tells

tells it you of many Biſhops by name. Therefore when *p.* 68. you ſay, [*I apply to you more than once*, 1 Theſ. 2. 15. *They pleaſe not God*, &c.] and add, [*I believe in my Conſcience he is miſtaken.*] Either by [*to us*] you mean, all the Conformiſts or Biſhops, and that is *not true*, as the words tell you: Or you mean, [*Us that procured or own, and execute the aforeſaid ſilencing, afflicting Acts:*] which your words ſeem to mean. And then I do but ſay, Oh! What may temptation bring even good mens Judgment to? Is the ſilencing of 2000, the afflicting of many times more of the Laity, the Jealouſies, Diſtractions, and Dangers of this Land, ſo ſmall a matter, or ſo good, that *God is not diſpleaſed with it?* And can you in *your Conſcience* own what the Biſhops did towards it? No wonder then if Ceremonies be called *things Indifferent*. Certainly *this cannot* be *Indifferent*? It is a moſt *meritorious* or *excellent* work, or elſe a *heinous Crime*: It is either ſuch a Cure as the cutting off a Cancerous Breaſt, or elſe if it be a ſin, it muſt be as great as contributing to the endangering of as many ſcore Thouſand Souls as 2000 Miniſters were likely to have helpt to ſave, and to the corrupting of the Church, and the Introduction of Popery. And few Chriſtians think that *Nathan* ſinned by unpeaceableneſs more than *David* by Murder and Adultery, though but once; or *Samuel* more than *Saul*; or the Prophet that reproved him more than *Jeroboam*; or Chriſt *Matth.* 23. more than the Phariſees; yea, or than *Peter*, *Mat.* 16. when he ſaid, *Get behind me Satan, thou ſavoureſt not the things that be of God*; or *Paul* more than *Peter*, *Gal* 2. or than the Jewiſh Teachers, whom he called the *Conciſion* & *Dogs*; or *John* than *Diotrephes*, &c.

Guilt is tender, and they that think God is of their Mind when he is ſilent, *Pſal.* 50. 21. will think men ſhould be ſo too. And man dare not bid defiance to God, and openly proclaim a War againſt him, and therefore hath no way to ſin in peace, but by a conceited bringing the Mind and Law of God to his. What ſin is there that Learned Men father not on God: And then they muſt be praiſed and not reproved, and then it's worſe than unpeaceable to aggravate that which they ſay God owneth; ſuch men as I, would think it ſcarce credible that the *Spaniſh* Inquiſition, the *French* Maſſacre, the Powder-Plot, the Murder of 200000 in *Ireland*, the Perjuring of a Nation, the ſilencing of Thouſands of faithful Miniſters, ſhould have one word of Juſtification

ſtcation ever ſpoken for it. But we are miſtaken: No doubt men can write learned Volumes to defend any of theſe; and if one do but ſay, *They pleaſe not God*, men may be found that can ſay, [*I believe in my Conſcience that you are miſtaken, and ſpeak unpeaceably: God is pleaſed with it all.*] Sure the day of Judgment will be much to juſtifie God himſelf, who is thus ſlandered as the Friend of every mans Sin. What wonder is it if there be numerous Religions in the World, when every ſelfiſh man maketh a God and a Religion of his own, fitted to his Intereſt and Mind? But when all men center onely in one God, and bring *their* Minds to *his*, and not conceitedly *his* to *theirs*, we may yet be One.

And if we could make men know, that *God is not for them*, and accepteth not of a Sacrifice of Innocent Blood, however men think that they do him *good Service*, yet they would not have this known: It's long ſince unhumbled Sinners turned Church-Confeſſion into Auricular; If *Saul* do ſay at laſt, *I have ſinned*, he would yet be honoured before the People. But the time is near when thoſe that honour God he will honour, and thoſe that deſpiſe him ſhall be lightly eſteemed.

Few men living can eaſier bear with others for different forms and Ceremonies than I; but I take not the ſilencing and ruining of 2000 Miniſters for Ceremonies (were that the worſt of it) to be a Ceremony.

§ 6. *Pag.* 69. You ſay, *We are not all of one mind yet*: A ſad word from a Biſhop. Do you think that any two Men on Earth are of one mind in all things? Were thoſe agreed whom *Paul* perſuadeth, *Rom.* 14. to *receive each other, but not to doubtful Diſputations*, and not to *judge* or *deſpiſe* each other, (much leſs to ſilence, impriſon, and deſtroy.) We are agreed in all that is conſtitutive of Chriſtianity, and agreed that all Chriſtians ſhould love others as themſelves, and do as they would be done by. I confeſs if you have ſuch eminent *Self-denial*, as to be willing, if ever you differ from the publick Impoſitions, about the lawfulneſs of any one thing, to be not only caſt out of your Lordſhip and Biſhoprick, but to be ſilenced, impriſoned and deſtroyed, I cannot accuſe you of *Partiality* but of *Errour*. I have known too many Conformiſts who needed no Biſhop to ſilence them, (they never preached.) But that will not juſtifie their deſires that others be ſilenced.

I have

I have oft enough told you in how many things the Conformists are disagreed: I now say the Bishops themselves are not agreed of the very *Species* of the *Church of England:* To say nothing of their disagreement of the *Constitutive, national Head* or *Governour*; they are not agreed, *whether it be only a part of an universal, humane, political Church, subject to an universal humane supream Power, who hath the right of Legislation and judgment over them, or whether it be a compleat national Church of it self*, a part only of the universal as Headed by Christ, but not as by Man, or as humane Politie, having no foreign Governour, Monarchical or Aristocratical, (Pope or Council.)

Overdoing is *illdoing* and *undoing*. He that would make such a Law of Concord, as that none shall live out of Prison who are not of the same Age, Complexion, Appetite, and Opinion, would depose the King, by leaving him no Subjects. The Inquisition is set up in Love of Unity: But we know that we shall differ while we know but in part: Only the perfect World hath perfect Concord. I greatly rejoice in that Concord which is among all that truly love God. They love one another, and agree in all that is necessary to Salvation: The Church of the Conformists is all agreed for *Crossing* and the *Surplice*, and for the *Imposed Oaths, Professions and Covenants*: Oh that all our Parishioners who plead for the Church were agreed that the *Gospel is true*, and that Christ is not a Deceiver, and that Man dyeth not as Dogs, but hath a Life of future Retribution.

§ 7. *P.* 69. Asking, [*Were not almost all the* Westminster *Assembly Episcopal Conformable men when they came thither?*] He can say, [*No, not in their hearts, as appeared by their fruits.*] And he cites some words of the sense of the Parliament, *Jun.* 12. 1643.

Ans. 1. See here a Bishop that knew the hearts of hundreds of men, whom he never saw, to be contrary to their Profession and constant Practice.

2. And he can prove by their reporting the Parliaments words what was these Ministers own Judgment.

3. And he can prove by those words in *Jun.* 1643. what was their Judgment a Year or two before, and is sure that the *Scots* Arguments did not change them.

4. And he can prove that those are no Episcopal Conformists who are for the ancient Episcopacy only (described by Bishop *Usher*,) and

and take the *Engliſh* frame to be only lawful, but not *unalterable*, or *beſt*. And if really he do take him to be no *Epiſcopal Conformiſt*, who is for enduring any way but their own, it is he and not I that gave them ſo bad a Character: It is he and not I that intimateth, that thoſe moderate Conformiſts who had rather Church-Government were reformed, than ſuch Confuſion made by ſilencing and hunting Chriſtians, are at the Heart no *Epiſcopal Conformiſts*: Their Hearts I confeſs much differ from the Silencers and Hunters.

§ 8. He maketh me a falſe Hiſtorian for *fixing the War on the Eraſtian Party in Parliament*. *Anſ.* Did I lay it only on the Eraſtians? Have I not undeniably proved that the War here began between two Epiſcopal Parties? Of which one part were of A. Bp. *Abbots*, Mr. *Hookers*, and the generality of the Biſhops and Parliaments mind, and the other of Bp. *Lauds*, *Sibthorps*, *Maynwarings*, *Heylins*, A. Bp. *Bromhalls*, &c. mind: And the firſt ſort ſome of them thought Epiſcopacy *Jure Divino*; but the *Engliſh* Frame not unreformable: And the other ſort thought it was but *Jure humano*, and theſe were called by ſome Eraſtians. Let him give me leave to produce my Hiſtorical proofs, even to ſingle men by name, that the *Engliſh* War began between theſe two Parties, and I defie all his falſe Contradiction: Only ſuppoſing, 1. That I ſpeak not of the King, nor of the War in *Ireland* or *Scotland*. 2. That I grant that the Nonconformiſts were moſt for the Parliament, and the Papiſts moſt againſt them.

But when I have ſaid ſo much to Mr. *Hinkley* already to prove this, did this Lord Biſhop think to be believed without confuting it?

§ 9. But it tranſcendeth all bounds of Hiſtorical credibility, that he anſwereth this by ſaying, [*He and all his Abettors muſt know the Catalogues of that Parliament, and that Aſſembly are ſtill in our hands, the Copies of their Speeches, and Journals of their Votes*, &c.] *Anſ.* They are ſo to the Shame of ſuch Hiſtorians. You have many of them in *Whitlocks* Memorials; I knew ſo great a number my ſelf of the Parliament, Aſſembly, and Army, as makes me pitty the Ignorant World, which is abuſed by ſuch Hiſtorians as you and yours.

§ 10. As for your aſſuring me that *you look one day to anſwer for all you ſay*, it minds me of the words of your Dr. *Aſheton*,

Chaplain to the Duke of *Ormond*, who *(as going to the Bar of God) undertakes to prove, that it is through Pride and Covetousness that we conform not.* The Inquisitors also believe a day of Judgment. And what is it that some men do not confidently ascribe to the most holy God?

§ 11. Your praises of me are above my desert: I am worse than you are aware of: But mens sins against Christs Church and Servants in *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* are never the less for that.

§ 12. You shew us that you are *deceived* before you *deceive*: You do but lead others into the way of falshood which you were led into your self, when you say, I am [*said to have asserted, that a man might live without any actual Sin.*] A Lord Bishop (*Morley* p. 13.) told it you, and you a Lord Bishop tell it others, and thus the poor World hath been long used; so that of such Historians men at last may grow to take it for a valid Consequence, [*It is written by them*: Ergo *it is incredible.*] I tell you first in general, that I have seen few Books in all my Life, which in so few Sheets have so many Falshoods in matters of Fact done before many, as that Letter of Bishop *Morley*'s; which upon your Provocation I would manifest, by Printing my Answer to him, were it not for the charges of the Press.

2. And as to your Instance, the case was this: Dr. *Lany* impertinently talkt of our being *justified only by the Act of Faith, and not the Habit*: I askt him whether we are unjustified in our sleep? which led us further, and occasioned me to say to some Objection of his, that *men were not always doing moral Acts good or evil*: and thence, [*that a man is not always actually sinning*, viz. *In a mans sleep, he may live sometimes and not actually sin; as also in an Apoplexy and other loss of Reason.*] Hence the credible Bishop *Morley* printed that I said, *A man may live without any actual Sin*: Yea, and such other Reasons are given for his forbidding me to preach the Gospel. And now another pious L. Bp. *going to answer it at Judgment*, publisheth it as from him. O what a World is this, and by what hands are we cast down? Is my Assertion false or doubtful? Dr. *Bates* and Dr. *Jacombe* who were present are yet both living. By such men and means is the Church as it is: Arise O Lord and save it from them.

§ 13. You tell me, as Bp. *Morley*, of being the *top of a faction of my own making, neither Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent*,

dent, or Eraſtian. *Anſ.* So, to be againſt all Faction is to be the top of a Faction: I am neither an Arian, nor a Sabellian, nor an Apollinarian, nor a Macedonian, nor a Neſtorian, or Eutychian, or Monothelite, or a Papiſt, *&c.* Conclude *ergo* I am the top of a new Hereſie, and ſilence and impriſon me for it, and your Dioceſane Conformity will be paſt all ſuſpicion (even at the heart.) But you will one day know, that to be againſt all Faction, and yet to bear with the Infirmities of the weak, and love all Chriſtians as ſuch, is a way that had a better Author.

§ 14. *P.* 73, 74. As to your extolled Friend a *Nonconformiſt*, who you ſay, told you that [*I am not able to bear being gainſaid in any thing, for want of Academick Diſputes*, &c.

Anſ. 1. Was your great Friend ſo excellent a man, and was it a good work to ſilence him, with which in your Conſcience you think *God is pleaſed?*

2. Now you name him not, he cannot contradict you: Mr. *Bagſhaw* ſaid ſomthing like it of Mr. *Herle*, Prolocutor of the Aſſemblie, which his Acquaintance contradict.

3. I juſtifie not my Patience; it is too little: But verily if you had ſilenced me alone, and Gods Church and Thouſands of Souls had been ſpared, I think you had never heard me twice complain. Judge you whether I can endure to be gainſaid, when I think there are Forty Books written againſt me by Infidels, Socinians, Papiſts, Prelatiſts, Quakers, Seekers, Antinomians, Anabaptiſts, Sabbatarians, Separatiſts, and ſome Presbyterians, Independents, Eraſtians, Politicians, *&c.* which for the far greateſt part I never anſwered, though ſome of them written by Prelatiſts and Papiſts have ſpoken fire and Sword: Nor to my Remembrance did any or all theſe Books by troubling me ever break one hour of my ſleep, nor ever grieve me ſo much as my own ſin and pain (which yet was never extream) have grieved me one day. Alas Sir! How light a thing is the contradiction or reproach of man who is ſpeaking and dying almoſt at once?

§ 15. *P.* 75. As to my *Political Aphoriſms* I have oft told you I wiſh they had never been written: But all in them is not wrong which Biſhops are againſt. The firſt paſſage challenged by your Biſhop *Morley* is, *My calling a pretence to unlimited Monarchy by the name of Tyranny*, adding my reaſon, *becauſe they are limited by God who is over all.* Miniſters were never under Turks thought worthy of puniſhment for ſuch an Aſſertion: But Biſhop

ſhop *Morley* is no Turk. If Monarchs be not limited by God, they may command all their Subjects to deny God, or blaſpheme him, to take Perjury, Murder, and Adultery, for Duties: and they are unwiſe if ever they will be ſick, die, or come to Judgment.

§. 16. You ſay, [*"I was told by a Reverend Prelate, that at "the Conference at the* Savoy, *Mr.* Baxter *being demanded what "would ſatisfie him, replied, All or Nothing: On this I reflected "on what that grave Divine told me.*]

Anſ. Alas good man! if for all other your hiſtorical notices you are faln into ſuch hands, what a maſs of Untruths is in your Brain? But why will you diſhonour Reverend Prelates ſo much as to father them on ſuch? I never heard the queſtion put [*What will ſatisfie you?*] nor any ſuch anſwer as *All or Nothing*: When the King commiſſioned us to treat of ſuch *Alterations as were neceſſary to tender Conſciences*, the Biſhops, 1. Would not treat till we would *give them in writing all that we blamed in the Liturgy, and all the Alterations we would have, and all the additional Forms we deſired.* 2. When thus conſtrained, we offered theſe on ſuppoſition, that on Debate much of it would be denied us, or altered; but they would not vouchſafe us any Debate on what we offered, nor a word againſt our *additional Forms*, *Reply*, or *Petition for Peace.* 3. To the laſt hour they maintained, that *No alteration at all was neceſſary to tender Conſciences.*] And ſo they ended, and the Convocation doubled and trebled our Burden, and the Biſhops in Parliament together.

Once Biſhop *Couſins* deſired us to lay by *Inconveniences*, and name only what we took for *downright Sin.* I gave him a Paper deſcribing *Eight ſuch*: We did but begin to debate one of them, (*Caſting ſuch from the Communion of Chriſts Church that dare not take the Sacrament kneeling, though they be miſtaken*) and our time ended.

Dr. *Pierce* undertook to prove it a Mercy to them to deny them the Sacrament; and he made a motion to me, that he and I might go about the Land to preach men into ſatisfaction and Conformity: I asked him how I could do that when they intended to ſilence me? For though I ſcrupled not kneeling at the Sacrament, if they made any one Sin the condition of my Miniſtry, I ſhould be ſilenced, though they abated all the reſt. It may be this went for [*All or Nothing.*] And I am ſorry that

the

the Biſhops be not of the ſame mind: St. *James* was, that ſaid; *He that breaketh one is guilty of all*: And Chriſt was, who ſaid, *He that breaketh one of the leaſt of theſe commands, and teacheth men ſo, ſhall be called leaſt in the Kingdom of God.*

So that it was not *All Inconveniences*, but *All flat Sins* that we craved in vain to have been exempted from: Much leſs was it the *Eſtabliſhment* of all that we propoſed to have been *treated* of, openly profeſſing our ſelves ready to alter any thing amiſs or needleſs upon treaty, and ſuppoſing there would be many ſuch words: But they would not touch our offered additions, nor entertain any treaty about them.

And now pitty your ſelf who have been drawn to believe ſuch Reverend Prelates as you ſay, and pitty ſuch as your Writings will deceive.

§ 17. That you take it to be contrary to a Chriſtian temper to be ſenſible of the Sufferings of the Church, and to name and deſcribe the ſin that cauſeth them, and that but in a neceſſitated Apology for the Sufferers, is no wonder, the Reaſons and your Anſwer I gave you before § 4. and 5. I think it no breach of Peace with Perſecutors or Silencers, to tell them what they do, eſpecially when the Sufferers are feigned to deſerve it all; and not to ſin and that deliberately, is made a ſin deſerving all that we ſuffer and the Nation by it.

§ 18. But *p.* 77. tells us yet more whence your Errours come, even by believing falſe Reports, and then reporting what you believe. You ſay, [*Some People have talked of a Combination or Pact amongſt themſelves, that except they might have their own Will throughout, they would make the World know what a breach they could make, and how conſiderable they were.*]

Anſ. 1. Do you not think that *Rogers*, *Bradford*, *Philpot*, and the reſt, did ſo in Qu. *Maries* days, and that it was they that made the Breach by being burnt? What is it that ſuch Hiſtorians may not ſay? So *Luther* was taught by the Devil, *Bucer* was killed by the Devil, ſo was *Oeclampadius*, *Calvin* was a ſtigmatized Sodomite, and what not: And even the moſt publick things are yet uncertain before our Eyes: *Godfrey* killed himſelf: The Papiſts had no Plot: The Presbyterians have a Plot againſt the King: The Nonconformiſts ſilenced themſelves: And did not the Citizens of *London* burn their own Houſes? When you that are a Biſhop cite other great Biſhops for ſuch things as

you

you do, may it not come in time to be the *Faith of the Church*, and thence to be *neceſſary* to all.

2. But how do you think all theſe that were ſcattered all over *England*, and knew not one another by name or Dwelling, ſhould ſo confederate?

3. Do but think of it as a man. There were Nine or Ten Thouſand Miniſters that had conformed to the Parliaments way in poſſeſſion: They were all to conform or be caſt out. The Book and Act of Uniformity came not out of the Preſs till about that very day *Aug.* 24. Neither Conformiſts, nor (after) Nonconformiſts could ſee it, but thoſe in or near *London*: What time was there to tell them all over *England* in one day? How knew we who would conform and who would not, when Nine Thouſand were equally in Poſſeſſion? If we had written to them all, would not One Thouſand of our Letters have detected it? Or at leaſt ſome of thoſe that conformed, with whom we prevailed not?

4. What was it that moved them all to this Confederacy? To ſuffer Ruine in the World? To *make themſelves conſiderable you ſay, and ſhew what a Breach they could make?* And for what? *Unleſs they might have all their own Wills?* And what was their Will? Was it to be Lord Biſhops? Or domineer over any? Or to get great Benefices? I think no high-way Robbers do any Villanies meerly to ſhew what miſchief they can do, much leſs ruine themſelves to ſhew that they can do Miſchief by Suffering. Some ſuch thing is ſaid of ſome odd Circumcellians that they killed themſelves to make others thought their Perſecutors: But Perſecution was more hated then than now. Did the former Life and Doctrine of theſe Two Thouſand men ſignifie a Spirit ſo much worſe than the reſt?

5. And do you think that the other Seven Thouſand or Eight Thouſand that conformed did confederate beforehand to conform? How could they do it who declared Aſſent and Conſent to every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book which they never ſaw, unleſs they confederated at a venture, to do whatever was impoſed? And if Seven Thouſand could agree without confederating, why not Two Thouſand? I could not then have my Poſt Letters paſs without Interception: And it's a wonder that no Letter of this Confederacy was taken.

And I'le tell (not you, but thoſe that believe me) how far we were from it. When we were all caſt out and ſome new motion

tion was made for our ſervice, one weak man moved here, that we might draw up a conſenting Judgment to how much we could yield, that we might not differ. I anſwered that it was not our buſineſs to make a Faction, or to ſtrengthen a Party; nor were we *all of one judgment* about *every Ceremony*, and therefore no man muſt go againſt his judgment for a Combination with the reſt: If they would abate but ſo much as any one mans Conſcience would be ſatisfied in, that one man muſt ſerve the Church accordingly. And if any were taken in, the reſt would rejoyce.] This Anſwer ſilenced that motion, and I never heard any move it more: And I am fully aſſured there was never ſuch a Combination.

But with this exception: How far any thought the Covenant bound them againſt our Prelacy I cannot tell. Thoſe that I convers'd with ſaid, it bound them to no more than they were bound to before. But I confeſs we did all confederate in our Baptiſm, againſt willful ſin: And I know of no other Confederacies but theſe: which indeed was enough to make all men forbear what they judged to be ſinful.

§ 19. You add, [" *But yet it is not fair to over-reckon knowingly, and in ordinary courſe Two Hundred in the ſum, as Mr.* Baxter *and others do*, p. 155, 210. *thereby to ſwell the account to the greater* odium, *by complaining roundly Two Thouſand: This I muſt conclude to be done knowingly, for ſomtimes he only mentions One Thouſand Eight Hundred*, p. 151, &c.]

Anſ. I am perſuaded that it is not knowingly that you ſpeak ſo much beſides the truth; but for want of knowing what and whom you talk of. I never medled with gathering the number, Mr. *Calamy* did, and ſhewed us a Liſt of 1800, upon which I long mentioned no more, and ſeldom ſaw him afterward: But Mr. *Ennis* who was more with him, aſſuring me that they had after an account of at leaſt 200 more, who were omitted; I ſometime to ſpeak the leaſt mention the 1800, and ſometime ſay about 2000, and by his laſt account that was the leaſt. Yet with a Lord Biſhop that knoweth nothing of all this, I *knowingly over-reckon*: But if *God be pleaſed* with their ſilencing, why do you take this ill?

§ 20. The next and great Accuſation is my *extenuating the* Biſhops *Clemency, and aggravating our Sufferings, and that againſt my Conſcience I impute to the Biſhops that bloodineſs which they never*

ver intended but abhor. And he will not believe what I say of the death of any by Impriſonment or want.

Anſ. The good Lady that pitied the Beggars when ſhe came in out of the Froſt and Snow, when ſhe had warmed her ſelf, chid them away, and ſaid, it was warm enough. I could name you thoſe in *London*, that travelled out of the North in great want, and took up with ſuch cold Lodgings here in great want of all things, that they were paſt cure before their miſery was known. How many poor Quakers have dyed in Priſon many know: It's like you never heard of the death of Mr. *Field*, a worthy Miniſter, in the *Gate-houſe*; nor of Mr. *Thompſon* in the noiſome Priſon at *Briſtol*, nor of Reverend Mr. *Hughes* of *Plimouth*'s Death, cauſed by his Priſon ſickneſs; perhaps you never read the Life, Sufferings, and Death of excellent *Joſeph Allen* of *Taunton*: I will not be the gatherer of a larger Catalogue, But I believe ſome others will. But theſe you *know not of.*

§ 21. The words in my Book which I ſpeak argumentatively, ſhewing clearly whither their cauſe will lead them, if they truſt to bring us to Unity by force, you unworthily feign that I ſpeak as accuſing the Biſhops Inclinations. My Argument was, *If you think by violence to effect your ends, it muſt be either by changing mens judgments, or by forcing them as Hypocrites to go againſt their judgments, or elſe by utter deſtroying them till there are no Diſſenters: But none of theſe three ways will do it*: Ergo *Violence will not do it.* 1. I prove that force will not change their Judgments. 2. I prove they are ſuch men as will rather ſuffer death than ſin againſt their Conſciences; and ſo leſs Sufferings which cure not do but exaſperate the Diſeaſe. 3. I prove that if, when leſs doth no good, you would deſtroy them, that would not do your work but croſs it. And doth this ſignifie that I charge the Biſhops with bloody purpoſes? They openly tell us that it's *puniſhing* us that muſt bring us to Concord. I tell them, *Leſſer will not do it, and greater will but hurt themſelves.* A man would think that I hereby rather infer that Biſhops *will not be bloody*, than that *they will*, when I argue *ab incommodo*. Truly Sir, I ſee nothing in your Book which tempted me to lament, that I miſt the happineſs of your Academical Education or Diſputes: Nor do I envy thoſe that now enjoy it. God ſave his Church from the worſer part of them.

§ 21. You ſay, *p.* 79. You *muſt needs look on my aggravating*

my

my own and the Diſſenters Sufferings beyond Truth, you are ſure beyond Probability, to have proceeded from want of temper. As for ſaying that ſome *have lived on brown Bread and Water.*

Anſ. I find ſtill that our difference lieth in matter of Fact, done in the open ſight of the World: And if it were whether we are *Engliſh*-men, I have no hope of ending it! O what is Hiſtory! My own Sufferings by them are very ſmall, ſave the hindering of my Labour: Leave to work is all the Preferment that ever I deſired of them: What I have had hath been againſt their Wills, who have called out for my greater reſtraint. God hath enabled me by the Charity of others to ſend ſome ſmall relief to a few of thoſe whoſe Caſe he will not believe. Some of them have Seven or Eight Children, and nothing at all of their own to maintain them, and live in Countries where ſcarce two Gentlemen of Eſtates within their reach do befriend them; and the People are generally poor; and many of theſe have none to preach to, being not permitted, And when they attempted to meet with ſome few ſecretly, to faſt and pray in ſome caſe of need, have had their few Goods carryed away by Diſtreſs. Good Alderman *Aſhhurſt*, now with Chriſt, took care of many, and hath ſhewed me Letters and Certificates of undoubted credit, in the very words which I named. One is now near us, that was put to get his Living by Spinning. Mr. *Chadwick* was the laſt of whom I read thoſe words in a juſt certificate, that he and his Children had long lived on meer brown Rye Bread and Water. It is now above a dozen Years ſince Dr. *Vermuxden* told me that Mr. *Matthew Hill* was his Patient, with Hydropical ſwell'd Legs, with drinking Water and uſing anſwerable Food through meer Poverty: But God turned it to good; for neceſſity drove him (when a little ſtrengthened) to *Mary-Land*, where he hath been almoſt the only able Miniſter they have. We that know them our ſelves, and beg Money to relieve them, are ſuppoſed to be Lyars: for telling that which all their Neighbours know. Through Gods Mercy few in *London* ſuffer ſo much, (though divers are in great ſtreights.) But great numbers in the Countrys who live among the poor, had not ſome of them now and then a little Relief from *London*, were like to beg for Bread, or fall into mortal Diſeaſes by Food unfit for Nature. Even in *London* they that knew Mr. *Farnworth*, Mr. *Spinage*, and ſome others, and how they lived and dyed, underſtand me, I'le name Mr. *Mar-*

** Dead since the writing of this.*

tin formerly of *Weedon*, *very poor in *London*, to tell you of your impartiality; though he loſt one Arm in the Kings Army, he had not a day abated him in *Warwick* Gaol for preaching.

§ 22. As to his repeating all my mention of their dealings, and my blaming the Biſhops at the *Savoy* for our preſent diviſions, and my aggravating the evils which Violence will produce if they truſt to that way, I judge it all neceſſary to be ſpoken: Unknown ſin will not be repented of nor forborn; nor unknown danger prevented; nor the unknown needs of the Peoples Souls relieved.

He asketh, *Is this the way to be at Peace with us?* I anſwer, There is no other way: What Peace can we have with them that think they are bound to ſilence us, and keep us ſix Months in Gaol for every Sermon, and ſo on for the next, and for the next? Or to pay 40 *l.* a Sermon, and to baniſh us five Miles from Corporations, and muſt not be told of any ſuch thing? He was not unpeaceable that ſaid, *He that ſeeth his Brother have need and ſhutteth up the Bowels of Compaſſion from him, how dwelleth the Love of God in him?* Nor for ſaying, *He that hateth his Brother is a Murtherer*: Nor Chriſt for telling us how he will judge them that did not relieve and viſit him in his little ones; and how he will uſe him that beat his Fellow-Servants. It is with you and not with your ſins that we would have peace. Not only *Maſſonius* and *Platina*, but even *Genebrard*, and *Baronius* ſpeak far ſharplier of the faults of many Popes themſelves, and all Hiſtorians of their Prelates, and yet are taken to be peaceable men. Either thoſe that I mentioned will repent here or hereafter, and then will ſay far worſe of themſelves than I do. And may I not foretel it them, when it is but in neceſſitated deprecation of the miſeries of the Land?

§ 23. One of their Champions wrote that he was *not bound to deny his own Liberty, becauſe others would pieviſhly take ſcandal at it.* I ſhewed the ſinfulneſs of that Concluſion, and that a mans Liberty often lay in as ſmall a matter as a game at Cheſs, a Pipe of Tobacco, or a Cup of Sack: and moſt ſcandal is taken by pieviſh perſons: and yet even a pieviſh mans Soul is not to be ſet as light by as ſuch things. Chriſt and *Paul* made more of Scandal: And this very arguing of mine is numbred with my unpeaceable diſtempered words.

§ 24. As to his talk about our Controverſies of paſſages in Conformity

Conformity, he confeſſeth that he hath not read my *Plea for Peace*, in which I have partly opened them: And much leſs what I have ſaid ſince of them to divers others; and I confeſs I have neither mind or leiſure to ſay all over again in Print, upon the occaſions of ſuch words as his, which have been oft anſwered.

§ 25. I named the Martyr-Biſhops *Hooper*, *Ridley*, &c. as Nonconformiſts to the Laws of their Perſecutors, to ſhew that ſuch Sufferers leave a ſweeter name than their Perſecutors; and he feigneth me to have made them Nonconformiſts to our Laws, and ſaith, [*Ingenuity and Chriſtian Veracity would bluſh to own this Art.*] Thus ſtill falſe Hiſtory is that which aſſaulteth us.

But I humbly ask his Lordſhip, 1. Whether he think that *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latimer*, were more for Conformity than *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, and *Hooker*, and *Abbot*? And 2. Whether he will ſo far reproach theſe men as to ſay, that *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, and *Hooker* would have conformed by approving that which they moſt expreſly wrote againſt? I have oft enough tranſcribed their words.

§ 26. To ſhew that ſince my expulſion I drew not the People of *Kiderminſter* from the Biſhops, I ſaid that I [*never ſince came near them, nor except very rarely ſent them one Line*; which he pretends I contradict, by ſaying, *I ſent them all the Books I wrote.* One might have found hiſtorical errours enough in his words without a Rack or Quibble. 1. Sure Books are ſomwhat rarelier written than Letters. 2. An ordinary Wit would have underſtood that I ſpoke of *one Line* of Manuſcript, or one Letter, and not of Printed Books, I delivered them to Mr *Simmons*, or their Neighbours to ſend them without Letters. And few of thoſe Books were written before this Apology.

§ 27. As a Self-contradicter he ſaith of me, *ſomtime I am againſt all Subſcribing*, as *p.* 60, 113. &c. *and ſometimes not.*

Anſ. Still untruth! *P.* 60. The words are [*If men were not driven ſo much to ſubſcribe and ſwear as they are at this day.*] Reader, is it true that this is *againſt All Subſcribing*?

Pag. 113. The words are, [*If we had learned the trick of ſpeaking, writing, and ſwearing in univerſal terms, and meaning not univerſally but particularly, as many do, we could ſay, or ſubſcribe, or ſwear as far as you deſire us.*] And [*Take off the penalty*

of ſubſcribing, declaring, croſſing, &c. *what good doth ſubſcribing a Sentence which he believeth not?*] Is this *againſt All Subſcribing?*

§ 28. Whether to profeſs our tenderneſs of other mens Reputation, and yet to name the nature and aggravations of the ſin which we fear our ſelves, when we are importuned to it, be contradictory, let the impartial judge.

§ 29. *P.* 92. He ſaith, as my judgment, [*To ſubſcribe and declare, that it is not lawful on any pretence whatſoever to take Arms againſt the King, or that an unlawful Oath cannot bind men to unlawful Actions, is Perjury, ſome of the greateſt that Hell ſuggeſteth.*] *Anſ.* Not one true word? I believe all this to be as he ſaith: Both in my firſt and ſecond *Plea for Peace*, I have largly told him what it is, and what it is not which I own; but he hath ſeen neither, and yet feigneth me to ſay or hold what I have ſo oft renounced.

§ 30. *P.* 94. He might have known how oft in Print I have retracted the Book called, *The Holy Common-Wealth*, wiſhing the Reader to take it as *Non-ſcriptum*: Yet he ſaith, [*as far as is generally known I have not done it.*] And how ſhould I make it generally known more than by oft Printing it?

§ 31. *P.* 95. He pittieth me for calling the Author of the *friendly Debate*, the *Debate maker*: And I pitty *England* for ſuch pittiers.

§ 32. *P.* 96. Whereas the Convocation hath impoſed on all Miniſters a Profeſſion of *undoubted certainty of the Salvation of dying baptized Infants*, without excepting thoſe of Atheiſts or Infidels, I ask whether all the *young, unſtudied* ſort of Miniſters have arrived at this *certainty* any more than I, and how they came by it? and crave their Communication of the aſcertaining Evidence. And what doth his Lordſhip but pretend that I call the *Convocation* theſe *young, unſtudied men*, as if they had made this Rubrick for none but themſelves?

§ 33. And he hath found another fault which exceedeth all, and that is, the Title and Dedication of my *Methodus Theologiæ*, where I ſay, that I dedicate it not to the *ſlothful, haſty, tired Sectaries*, &c. but *to ſtudious, ingenious, humble*, &c. *young men, as being the perſons that are above all others born, diſpoſed, conſecrated to Truth, Holineſs, and the Churches Peace*, &c.] Exceeding bad!

Will

Will you hear the proof that this is exceſſive Pride? 1. *The Book in the front indirectly and ſlily calls the Reader, ſlothful, raſh, fooliſh,* &c. *Anſ.* Is this true? 1. It is only thoſe that I would *not* have to be the Readers. Yea, 2. Only thoſe that I ſay it is *not dedicated to.*

And do you think there are none ſuch in the world? Will not his foreſaid *Debater*, and Dr. *Parker*, and Dr. *Sherlock*, and abundance more, tell you that the Nonconformiſts are many of them ſuch, and will you now deny it? If not, am I bound to dedicate my Book to ſuch? By what Obligation?

But he ſaith ſo *voluminous* and *emboſt* a Title will deter the Readers. But do you not know the *Dedication* from the *Title*, only becauſe it is printed on the Title Page? Is that unuſual?

But the odious Arrogance followeth, [*Could any thing eaſily be ſaid with more* (*appearance of*) *Arrogance; in the very Title Page too, than that his Book is above all others of the ſame Subject,* (*I know not how otherwiſe to interpret his* ſupra omnes, *viz.* Methodus Theologiæ Chriſtianæ,] *&c. framed, diſpoſed and hallowed to the propagation and growth of Holineſs, to the Peace and Honour of the Church.*] *I will now for ever acquit him of hypocritical Modeſty.*

Anſ. I deſire Mr. *Morrice* to compare this L.d. Bp's Tranſlation with that overſight of *Theodoret*'s words which he faſteneth on in me. What if I had ſaid that this Biſhop knoweth not how to interpret a plain Latine Sentence, as he ſaith it of himſelf? That which I moſt expreſly ſay of *pious, ingenious Youth*, he feigneth me to ſay of *my Book*. Reader, look on the Book and judge whether *Methodus*, the Nominative Caſe ſingular, agree with *natæ, diſpoſitæ, conſecratæ*, the Dative Caſe, when *Juventutis Parti ſtudioſæ, ſedulæ*, with many other Datives, went before it: There are no leſs than Twelve Adjectives joined to *Parti* in the Dative Caſe, and yet he conſtrueth the three laſt a agreeing with the very firſt Title-name in the Nominative Caſe. And is this the way to make me lament my want of his Academical Education? Is it any wonder if theſe men prove us Liars and proud, and if they ſentence us for leſſer Crimes?

Yea, here he concludeth that I write [*ſo pievißly, ſo variouſly and unconſtantly to my ſelf, ſo blindly, as if willfully blind and not penitent of my own guilt, and ſo arrogantly, and diſdainfully,* &c.] You have heard the proof.

§ 24.

§ 34. *Pag.* 99. He proveth my *unpeaceableneſs* from the *Petition for Peace*, and *Additions to the Liturgy*: The Crime here is, [*There's not one Office, no not one Prayer of the old Liturgy*, and is ſtiled *A Reformation of the Liturgy, and little more than a Directory.*

Anſ. O miſerable World! What cure is there for thy Deceits? This good man talks as he hath heard, and ſo all goes on.

But 1. he knoweth not it ſeems what Title our Copy had, but judgeth by that which ſome body printed.

2. It ſeems he knoweth not that this Draught was only offered to debate, expecting abundance of Alterations: We openly declared that it was done on ſuppoſition of obliterating and altering all that they had any juſt exception againſt, were it but as *needleſs*. And for the clauſes, [*Theſe or the like words*] we profeſt, that we expected an Obliteration of them, but had rather the Biſhops did the impoſing part, if it muſt be done, than we.

3. He knew not it ſeems that ours were offered but as additional Forms, that ſuch of them as both ſides agreed on, might be mixt as *Alias's* with the old Liturgy. And doth his Lordſhip then exclaim with reaſon, that [*Not one Office, not one Prayer of the old was in*, when all (after correction) was to be in, and none left out. Oh what is Hiſtory! and what men are its corrupters?

And (that his work may be homogeneal) *p.* 100, 101. having recited my Commendation of their Liturgy as better than any in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, he addeth as an Accuſation, [Yet *p.* 219. *he complains of ſuch failings in it, that* IT IS A WORSHIP *which we cannot in faith be aſſured God accepteth.*]

Reader, This is one of the leſſer ſort of deceiving Accuſations. I ſaid that (among greater ſins which we fear in our Conformity) we fear leaſt by Aſſent and Conſent to all things contained and preſcribed. *&c.* we ſhould be guilty of juſtifying all the failings in that worſhip, and alſo of *offering to God a Worſhip that we cannot in faith be aſſured that he accepteth.* This Lord ſo wordeth it, that the Reader who peruſeth not my words would verily think that I had ſaid this of the Liturgy in the ſubſtance of Worſhip there preſcribed, which I ſaid only as to the things which we dare not conform to: And I explained it by ſaying, [*We dare not juſtifie the beſt Prayer we put up to God in all things.*] *E. g.* To dedicate Infants to God without their Parents expreſt Dedication, or conſent, or their promiſe to educate them as Chriſti-

Chriſtians, and this upon the falſe covenanting of Godfathers that never owned them, nor ever mean to educate them as promiſed, (as is known by conſtant experience, neither they nor the Parents intending any ſuch truſt in the undertakers) and to dedicate them by the ſacramental Sign of the Croſs, or a badge of Chriſtianity, and to refuſe all that will not be thus baptiſed. This we fear is a worſhip that God will not accept. But is this therefore ſaid of the ſubſtance of the Liturgy?

And if the Lord Bp. be wiſer or bolder than we, and be beyond all ſuch fears, ſhould he not ſuffer Fools gladly, ſeeing he himſelf is wiſe? And if he like not our fearing an Oath, Subſcription, Declaration, Covenant, or Practice, which he thinks to be true and good, and we think to be falſe and evil, why may he not endure our timorouſneſs while he may ruſh on himſelf and venture; ſhould he not rather pitty us, while St. *Paul* ſaith, *He that doubteth is damned if he eat, becauſe he eateth not in Faith.*

§ 35. *P.* 108. He queſtions whether their communion be my practice: and *p.* 110. giveth me two friendly Councils. 1. To peruſe my Books, and retract what's amiſs. 2. To tell the World now my ſober Thoughts, what I could and would do were I to begin the World again.

I heartily thank him for his Counſel, for it is good and honeſt. But alas, what a thing is it to write of things which men know not! 1. He knoweth not that I have retracted much already; partly by diſowning, and partly by large Obliterations: Of the firſt ſort are my *Aphor.* of Juſtification, and my *Polit. Aphoriſms* (though not all that's in them.) Of the 2d he may ſee many and large Obliterations in my *Saints Reſt*, my *Key for Catholicks*, &c.

2. He ſeemeth not to know what bloody Books, to prove me one of the worſt men living, their Church Advocates have written againſt me, fetcht mainly from theſe retracted Books and Words. Nor how they that commend *Auguſtine*, reproach me as mutable for thoſe Retractations.

3. It ſeemeth he knoweth not that I have already performed his ſecond Advice, in my *Cure for Church-Diviſions*, my *Second Plea for Peace*, (about *Government*) Yea, Biſhop *Morley* before the King, Lords, and Biſhops at *Worceſter-houſe*, ſpeaking of Ceremonies and Forms, cauſed my *Diſputations of Church-Government*, produced and ſaid, *No man hath written better than Mr.* Baxter, (as if it were againſt my ſelf.) And in Doctrinals, my

my Cathol. Theol. and *Methodus Theol.* and *Christian Directory* have expreſſed my matureſt, calmeſt thoughts. But he that conſels me to it knows not that it is already done. And more for Reviſing and Retractation I would do, if neceſſity did not divert me, even the want of time and ſtrength.

§ 36. *P.* 115. You ſay. [*That Reverend and great man Bp.* Morley *tells us* [*the generality of Nonconforming Divines ſhewed themſelves unwilling to enter on Diſpute, and ſeemed to like much better another way, tending to an amicable and fair compliance, which was wholly fruſtrated by* ——— *a certain perſons furious eagerneſs to engage in a Diſputation.*] *This was it ſeems the ſenſe of both ſides at that time.*]

Anſ. How far from Truth? It was the ſenſe and Reſolution of the reconciling Party, called by them Presbyterians: We all deſired nothing but an amicable Treaty— We were promiſed by ——— they ſhould meet us half way. When we met, Biſhop *Sheldon* declared the Agreement of his Party, that *till we had brought in all our Exceptions againſt the Liturgies, and our additional Forms, they would not treat with us.* Mr. *Calamy*, Mr. *Clark*, and others, would have taken that as a final Refuſal, and meddled no more, leſt Diſpute ſhould do more harm than good: I was againſt ſuch an untimely end, and ſaid, *They will report that we had nothing to ſay: It's better let the caſe be ſeen in writing, than ſo break off.* The reſt wrote the *Exceptions* about the Liturgies: ſome Agent of the Biſhops anſwered them without the leaſt conceſſion for alteration at all. I wrote a *Reply*, and the *Additional Forms*, and a *Petition to the Biſhops*, and they would treat of never a one of them: But at the end, put us to diſpute to prove *any Alteration neceſſary*, they maintaining *that none at all was neceſſary to the eaſe of tender Conſciences.* (Of which before.)

§ 37. I had thought to have proceeded, but truly the work which the Biſhop maketh me is ſo unpleaſant, almoſt all about the truth or Falſhood of notorious matter of Fact, that I have more Patience to bear his Accuſations (whatever his learned Friend ſaid of my impatience) than to follow him any further at this rate. But whereas he ſaith, that [*ſome will think that many things in his Book want truth.*] I am one of thoſe, and leave it to the Readers Judgment whether they judge not truly: And whereas he lays ſo much ſtreſs on Bp. *Morley*'s words, if any Printer ſhall be at the charge of Printing it, I purpoſe while he and the Witneſſs are yet alive, to publiſh the Anſwer to his Letter, which I caſt by to avoid Diſpleaſure. And if they will ſtill be deceived, let them be deceived. I cannot help it.

It is no wonder that he that is deſcribed, *Joh.* 8. 44. ſhould carry on his Kingdom accordingly in the World: But muſt his Dial be ſet on the Steeple of Chriſts Church, and have a conſecrated Finger for its Index? O lamentable Caſe!

FINIS.